DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 509 JC 730 148

AUTHOR	Trent, James W.; And Others
TITLE	The Study of Junior Colleges. Volume IIA, Technical Appendixes to Volume II, Diverse Dimensions of Community Colleges: Case Studies of 15 Institutions.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Statistics (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-4795
NOTE	383p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Characteristics; *Case Studies; *Community Colleges; Counselor Characteristics; *Junior Colleges; Student Characteristics; *Surveys; *Tables (Data); Teacher Characteristics; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

Volume IIA of The Study of Junior Colleges contains the technical appendixes to Volume II. The appendixes contain: (A) tables to Chapter 3 (Institutional Profiles) and the institutional profiles; (B) interview schedules for key administrators and tables to Chapter 4 (Administrative Profiles); (C) student marginal data and tables to Chapter 5 (Student Profiles); (D) faculty marginal data and tables to Chapter 6 (Faculty Profiles); (E) counselor marginal data and table to Chapter 7 (Counselor Profiles); (F) tables to Chapter 8 (Staff and Students: Comparative Perspectives); and (G) form letters sent to survey subjects. (For related documents, see JC 730 146-147, 149.) (KM)

ED 077509

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
Contract No. OEC-0-70-4795

VOLUME IIA: TECHNICAL APPENDIXES TO VOLUME II
DIVERSE DIMENSIONS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CASE STUDIES OF 15 INSTITUTIONS

By
James W. Trent, Principal Investigator
Barbara Dorf
Ronald Hart
Felice Karman
Roberta Malmgren

with
Glenn F. Nyre

December 1972

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
UCLA
Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California

Educational Research and Development

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
U.S. Office of Education
National Center for Educational Statistics

JC 730 148

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 13 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Preface

The present volume is part of the second of three reporting on The Study of Junior Colleges undertaken in conjunction with the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation for the U.S. Office of Education. The project was initiated under the auspices of the Office of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics. It was designed to help close the gap that exists between data needs of policy-makers and available bodies of statistics on junior colleges. The primary purposes of the project were: (1) to ascertain major problems and needs articulated by leaders in the junior college, (2) to determine the availability and quality of data existing in the central records of junior colleges, (3) to identify other important descriptions that can only be obtained directly from students and staff, (4) to assist the Office of Education in determining what criteria should be used to measure and analyze the special needs and performances of junior colleges, and (5) to serve as a first step in the development of a national data bank on junior colleges.

The purpose of the data bank will be twofold: (1) to supply the information needed by administrators, educators, and researchers who are concerned with the evaluation and future development of the community junior college; (2) to provide data for the various federal, regional, and state agencies which are concerned with the problems of policy formation and program development in the junior colleges.

In order to meet its objectives, the project included the following activities:

(1) Interviews with leaders and experts in the junior college field to obtain their assessment of the objectives, problems, needs, and processes important to the continued development of the junior college and to obtain their perceptions of the quantitative information needed to clarify and assist in dealing with these issues.

(2) An analytical review of the literature on junior colleges to determine further the issues and variables relevant to the development and evaluation of junior colleges.

(3) In-depth case studies of 15 different types of junior colleges to assess the dynamics of junior colleges and to determine those variables important to the understanding of these dynamics.

> (4) The development, pretesting, and justification of a prototypic Junior College Supplement to the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) system.
>
> (5) The development of a series of measurements and items contained in comprehensive prototypic survey instruments for use of future evaluation research on junior colleges.

Volume I contains the analytic review of the literature on junior colleges. Volume II contains the results of the case studies and concomitant surveys, and the administrative interviews; tables and other appendix materials related to Volume II are bound separately in the present Volume IIA: Technical Appendixes. The measurements and instrumentation derived from the project for future evaluation surveys comprise Volume III. The HEGIS Junior College Supplement has been submitted to the Office of Education separately.

The following staff members at UCLA were on the Advisory Committee for The Study of Junior Colleges and contributed to the initial implementation of the project: Arthur M. Cohen, Associate Professor of Higher Education; Principal Investigator and Director, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges; Richard D. Howe, Assistant Executive Director, League for Innovation in the Community College; Director, UCLA Junior College Leadership Program; and C. Robert Pace, Professor of Higher Education; Director, Higher Education Evaluation Program, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Dr. John Lombardi of UCLA's ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges graciously contributed to the development of the project's interview schedule for administrators. He also chaired the "Santa Fe Revisited" conference which was sponsored by the project to obtain inputs from major leaders of the junior college movement who originally presented their ideas in a series of discussions at Santa Fe College under the coordination of Joseph Fordyce. The participants of this conference are also gratefully acknowledged.

William Keim, former Assistant Superintendent of Community Services, Cerritos College, and current Chairman of the Community Services Committee of the American Association of Junior Colleges, helped in the preparation of instrument items relating to community services. Jane Matson, Professor of Guidance and Counseling, California State University, Los Angeles, assisted The Study of Junior Colleges staff in the development of the counselor questionnaire as well as with the selection of case-study sites. In addition, two project staff members visited the National Laboratory for Higher Education to discuss matters of sampling and survey techniques and selection of case-study schools with various NLHE staff, and in particular with John Roueche, who was at that time Director of the Junior and Community College Division.

A number of other agencies were likewise consulted, such as the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, whose files were used extensively in preparing the literature review (a major determinant of items included in the survey forms) and the UCLA Survey Research Center which offered suggestions regarding sampling techniques, questionnaire construction, and survey procedures.

A number of experts in the field were most helpful in their review of the HEGIS supplement. These included Dorothy Knoell, Dennis J. Jones, Charles R. Walker, William Morsch, and Edmund Gleazer.

Outstanding supporting staff members included Barbara Vizents, Jan Newmark, Lenois Stovall, Vera Lawley, Janet Katano, Irene Chow, and, most particularly, Lenore Korchek. Jane C. Beer was most helpful in preparing the project's volumes for publication. Winston Doby and Robert Collins graciously assisted with the site visits. Richard Seligman, Associate Director of the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, was most helpful in directing the Center's resources towards the successful completion of the project.

The extensive project could not have been completed without the exceptional talent and commitment of the research staff. These included Patrick Breslin, Barbara Dorf, Robert Fitch (who initiated the early coordination of the project), Ronald Hart, Janet Hoel, Roberta Malmgren, Ann Morey, and Clare Rose. Clarence Bradford and Ricardo Klorman were indispensable in their overseeing the data analyses. Ernest Scalberg was equally indispensable in his direction of the sub-project focussed on the development and pretesting of the HEGIS supplement. Above all, appreciation is extended to Michael Gaffney and Felice Karman who directed the project during its inevitably difficult and complex stages.

James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iii

APPENDIX A: TABLES TO CHAPTER 3 AND INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES 1

Tables to Chapter 3 3
- 3-1 Description of Institutions' Establishment 5
- 3-2 State Supervisory Agencies 7
- 3-3 Local Supervisory Agencies 9
- 3-4 Institutions' Budgets, Sources of Income, and Expenditures Per Student 12
- 3-5 Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios 15
- 3-6 Evaluation of Faculty 17
- 3-7 Sources of Students 19
- 3-8 Enrollment Status 21
- 3-9 Program Emphasis and Enrollment 23
- 3-10 Students' Academic Aptitude and High School Performance 25
- 3-11 Ethnic Composition of the Student Bodies and Communities (In Percent) 27
- 3-12 Graduates and Withdrawals 29
- 3-13 Student Financial Aid 31
- 3-14 New Majors Added In the Past Five Years 36
- 3-15 Programs and Aid for Disadvantaged Students 38
- 3-16 Community Characteristics I 42
- 3-17 Community Characteristics II 44
- 3-18 Community Services I 46
- 3-19 Community Services II 54
- 3-20 Institutional Research 60

Institutional Profiles 67
- Appleton 69
- Carter 73
- Foster 78
- Kinsey 82
- Langston 86
- Lowell 90
- Manning 95
- Meade 101
- Newson 105
- Palmerston 109
- Quanto 113
- Shaw 117
- Sherwood 121
- Walden 126
- Ward 131

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS AND TABLES TO CHAPTER 4 135

Interview Schedules 137
- Junior College President 137
- Dean of Instruction 142
- Dean of Vocational Education 145
- Dean of Pupil Personnel Services 149
- Fiscal Officer 152

Tables to Chapter 4
- 4-1 Distribution of Type of Educational Goals Stressed by Junior College Presidents 155
- 4-2 Distribution of Student-Oriented Educational Goals of Junior College Presidents 156
- 4-3 Distribution of Type of System Function Stressed in Role Definition by Junior College Presidents 157
- 4-5 Frequency of Administrators' Reference to Faculty-Administration Problems 158
- 4-6 Frequency of Administrators' Reference to Major Administrative Problems 159
- 4-7 Assessment of Specific Areas of College-Community Relations as Reported by Junior College Presidents 160
- 4-8 Major Educational Needs of the Community as Reported by Deans of Instruction and Deans of Vocational Education 161
- 4-9 Strengths and Weaknesses of Federal Funding Programs as Reported by Deans of Instruction, Deans of Vocational Education, and Chief Fiscal Officers 162

APPENDIX C: STUDENT MARGINAL DATA AND TABLES TO CHAPTER 5 163

Student Questionnaire with Marginal Data 165
- Common Form 169
- Form A 185
- Form B 191
- Form C 201

Tables to Chapter 5 211
- 5-1 Students' Age 213
- 5-2 Students' Marital Status 214
- 5-3 Married Students' Number of Children 215
- 5-4 Students' Religious Affiliation 216
- 5-5 Students' Race 217
- 5-7 Students' Family Income at Age 17 219
- 5-9 Time Students' Decided to Attend College 221
- 5-10 Persons with Whom Students Discussed Educational Plans and Vocational Interests During High School "Often" or "Very Often" 222
- 5-11 Persons with Whom Students Discussed Educational Plans and Vocational Interests During High School 223
- 5-12 Person with Greatest Influence on Students' College Attendance 227

5-13 Proportion of Students' High School Friends Attending College 228
5-14 Students' Major Reason for Attending College 229
5-15 Most Important Reason Why Students Chose Their Particular College 230
5-16 Students'' Immediate Educational Objectives 231
5-17 Students' Anticipated Transfer Degree 232
5-18 Number of Semester Units Completed 233
5-19 Type of Courses in Which Student is Enrolled 234
5-20 Students' Current Major 235
5-21 Students' College Grade Average 237
5-22 Proportion of Students who Reported Over 50 Percent Financial Support for Their Education, by Source 238
5-23 Proportion of Students who Reported any Financial Support for Their Education, by Source 239
5-24 The Extent Students Reported Finances to be a Problem to Their Educational Progress 244
5-25 Students' Response as to Whether or Not Financial Assistance was Available to Them 245
2-26 Students' Current Employment Status 246
5-27 Students' Opinions of the Effect of Work on Their Educational Progress 247
5-28 Proportion of Students Planning to Make Careers of Their Current Occupations 248
5-29 Students' Anticipated Occupations 249
5-30 Extent of Students' Agreement That Their Teachers Possess Various Qualities 251
5-31 Students' Perceptions of the Availability of Their Instructors Outside of Class 264
5-32 Composite of Problems with Which Students Needed, Sought, and Received Help 265
5-33 Problems with Which Students Reported Needing Help 274
5-34 Problems about Which Students Talked to Their Counselors 277
5-35 Problems with Which Students Found Their Counselors Helpful 280
5-36 Average Number of Interviews Students Reported Having with Counselors Each Term 283
5-37 Students' Perceptions of the Ease in Seeing a Counselor 284
5-38 Students' Perceptions of Their Counselors' Decision-Making Style 285
5-39 Proportion of Students Who Felt Their Counselors Gave Them Adequate Career and Academic Information 286
5-40 Students' Rating of Their Counselors on Various Personal Traits 287
5-41 Composite of Students Who Considered Their Colleges' Counseling and Assistance Services as "Strong 292
5-42 Students' Perceptions of Strengths and Weaknesses of Their Colleges' Student Personnel Services 294
5-43 Proportion of Students Reporting Attending the College of Their Choice 299

APPENDIX D: FACULTY MARGINAL DATA AND TABLES TO CHAPTER 6 301

Faculty Questionnaire with Marginal Data 303

Tables to Chapter 6 347
6-1 F Ratios and Extreme Institutional Mean Factor Scores of Faculty Members' Viewpoints on Social Issues 349
6-2 The Faculty's Professional Educational Experiences and Length of Service Prior to Their Current Position 350
6-3 F Ratios and Extreme Institutional Mean Standard Factor Scores of Faculty Members' Perception of Their College Environments 351
6-4 F Ratios and Extreme Institutional Mean Standard Factor Scores of Faculty Members' Perceptions of What Benefits Their Students Do and Should Receive 352
6-5 F Ratios and Extreme Institutional Mean Standard Factor Scores of Faculty Members' Perceptions of Their Students' Characteristics 353
6-6 Amount of Responsibility the Majority of Faculty Considered Each Constituent Group Should Have for Each Specified Administrative Activity 354

APPENDIX E: COUNSELOR MARGINAL DATA AND TABLE TO CHAPTER 7 355

Counselor Questionnaire with Marginal Data 357

Table to Chapter 7 371
7-1 Counselors who Reported Spending Various Proportions of Their Time in Various Counseling Activities 373

APPENDIX F: TABLES TO CHAPTER 8 375

8-1 Faculty's Perception of Present and Future Educational Priorities (In Percent) 377
8-2 Students' Reasons for Their Attendance at Their Particular Colleges (In Percent) 378
8-3 Faculty's Pooled Perceptions of Benefits Students do Versus Should Receive Very Much (In Percent) 378
8-4 The Three Student Benefits Eliciting the Greatest and Least Differences in the Faculty's Perceptions of What Their Students Do Versus Should Receive (In Percent) 379
8-5 The Faculty's Perceptions of the Most Important Student Educational Benefits 380
8-6 The Counselors' Perceptions of Major Student Problems 381
8-7 Comparison of Counselor and Student Responses Concerning Length of Average Counseling Appointments (In Percent) 381
8-8 Comparison of Faculty and Student Evaluations of Student Personnel Programs (In Percent) 382
8-9 Faculty Perceptions of Current and Ideal Community Benefits: Three Highest and Three Lowest Percentage Responses for Each Category 383

8-11 Faculty Ratings of Instructor Qualifications (In Percent) 385

APPENDIX G: FORM LETTERS SENT TO SURVEY SUBJECTS 387

Letter to Students from College President 389
Letter to Students from Project Director 390
Letter to Faculty from College President 391
Letter to Faculty from Project Director 392
Letter to Counselors from College President 393
Letter to College Staff Members Supervising Follow-Up of Student Non-Respondents 394

APPENDIX A

TABLES TO CHAPTER 3
AND
INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

TABLES TO CHAPTER 3

TABLE 3-1

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONS' ESTABLISHMENT

Institution by socioeconomic level	Description of establishment
High	
Meade (W;S)	1964 Meade established.
	1966 Joined regional association.
Quanto (W;U-S)	1963 Established by state board of community colleges upon the request of the area community colleges.
Ward (W;U-S)	1905 Began as evening classes at local community center.
	1917 Became a division of major local university.
	1926 Ward Community Center Institute organized offering high school and technical courses.
	1938 Liberal arts added.
	1940 Ward Junior College Day Division established.
	1942 Ward division of university merged with Ward Junior College.
Middle	
Kinsey (W;R)	1966 Board of trustees elected.
	1968 Classes started.
Newson (W;R)	1916 Public junior college organized by high school PTA.
	1918 Opened as City Junior College.
	1966 City college district formed.
Walden (W;U-S)	1934 Established.
Appleton (M;U-S)	1964 District started with two colleges.
	1970 Appleton opened as newest district junior college.
Foster (M;U)	1962 City junior college district formed.
	1963 Classes started at Foster.
	1966 Received full accreditation from regional association.
Langston (M;U-S)	1948 Langston Trade and Technical Institute started by city board of education.
	1953 Renamed City College.
	1964 Renamed Langston when junior college district formed.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Description of establishment
Shaw (M;U)	1925 Established by state university. 1946 Control transferred to separate junior college district. 1951 Moved to present campus.
Sherwood (M;R)	1965 Established by state legislature. 1966 Classes started.
Low	
Manning (B;U)	1969 College opened under another name. 1971 Opened as Manning College in response to student demands for change.
Carter (M;S)	1916 Carter Junior College of Agriculture added as a department of Carter Union High School District. 1922 Separate Carter Junior College District formed. 1953 Evening college and summer session started. 1960 Moved to new campus constructed by bond from 1957 election.
Lowell (M;U)	1920 Series of conferences by education, city, industry and labor; began with classes in power sewing for garment workers. 1927 Board of education established present school; first called a trade school then a trade institute. 1949 Board of education established Lowell as a junior college offering A.A. and A.S. degrees. 1957 Present site opened. 1966 Lowell merged its business and data processing curriculum with another metropolitan college. 1969 Lowell became part of city community college district with elected board of trustees.
Palmerston (M;R)	1961 Chartered as result of bond issue in 1960. 1964 Designated as a technical institute by state board of education.

TABLE 3-2

STATE SUPERVISORY AGENCIES

Institution by socioeconomic level	Agency	Role of agency
High		
Meade (W;S)	State Department of Education	minimal[c] (no further information given)
Quanto (W;U-S)	18-member Board of Regional Community Colleges	Construction, finances, personnel policies; non-professional personnel, curriculum; student policies
Ward (W;U-S)	Regional Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools	Accreditation
Middle		
Kinsey (W;R)	State Department of education proposed a constitutional amendment to set up a State Board for Higher Education; State Board for Public Junior and Community Colleges & Bureau of Higher Education	Program approval; sets minimum teaching load; minimum tax assessment; appoints community advisory boards; establishes educational planning district and coordinating council
Newson (W;R)	State Department of Public Instruction	Approves curriculum; certification of teachers; approves budget; approves state aid; general overall control
Walden (W;U-S)	State Junior College Board	Regulatory; supplies money; reimbursement for courses based on enrollment; approves courses; investigates each state community college based on Standards & Criteria for recognition; approves technical-occupational programs
Appleton (M;U-S)	State Community College Board of Governors	Construction; finances; curriculum; admissions; tenure

Institution by socioeconomic level	Agency	Role of agency
Foster (M;U)	State Department of Education	No policy decisions made--only recommendations to the president and community college council
Langston (M;U-S)	State Community College Board of Governors	Construction; finances; curriculum; admissions; tenure
Shaw (M;U)	State Agency for Vocational-Technical Education; State Coordinating Board for Higher Education	Only as stipulated by legislation affecting 2-year colleges
Sherwood (M;R)	5-member State Board of Education; State Junior College Council (Division of Community Junior Colleges under the State Dept. of Education)	Responsible for all post-secondary education; income and construction (with local board); personnel (tenure, qualifications); establishes standards and criteria for work taught, approves establishment of public junior college regulations; appoints president; authorizes changes in tuition and fees; approves budget and issuance of certificates
Low		
Manning (B;U)	State Board of Higher Education	Construction; occupational curriculum; income; expenditures
Carter (M;S)	State Community College Board of Governors	Construction; finances, curriculum; admissions; tenure
Lowell (M;U)	State Community College Board of Governors	Tenure; construction; occupational curriculum; income and expenditures (with local board)
Palmerston (M;R)	Department of Community Colleges under State Board of Education	Primary authority for decision making on overall institutional policy; construction; budget; personnel policies, curriculum, admissions (with local board)

TABLE 3-3

LOCAL SUPERVISORY AGENCIES

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of local board	Role of board	Means of appointment	Type of district
High				
Meade (W;S)	Board of Trustees of the junior college district	Primary authority over construction, finances, personnel, curricula, student policies	Elected (2 from the city and 4 from the county for 6-year terms	Multi-campus
Quanto (W;U-S)	Quanto Community College Advisory Board	Student policies (admissions, academic standards, activities, conduct)	Appointed by the governor	Multi-campus
Ward (W;U-S)	21-member Ward Junior College District Board of Trustees	Construction, finances, personnel policies, curricula, student policies	11 are on the board of trustees of a sponsoring agency; 8 are nominated by the trustees for 3-year terms	Single-campus
Middle				
Kinsey (W;R)	7-member Board of Trustees	Personnel policies, admissions, facilities development	Elected by district voters	Single-campus
Newson (W;R)	11-member Board of Directors	Construction, finances, personnel policies, student policies, curricula	District election	Single-campus
Walden (W;U-S)	Board of Trustees of the junior college district	Construction, finances, personnel policies, student policies, curricula	Appointed by the mayor for 3-year terms	Multi-campus

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of local board	Role of board	Means of appointment	Type of district
Appleton (M;U-S)	7-member District Board of Trustees	Student policies, personnel policies, construction, curricula, finances	Elected	Multi-campus
Foster (M;U)	6-member Junior College District Board of Trustees	Primary authority over construction, finances, personnel policies, curricula, student policies	Elected	Multi-campus
Langston (M;U-S)	7-member District Board of Trustees	Student policies, personnel policies, curricula, construction, finances	Elected	Multi-campus
Shaw (M;U)	7-member Board of Trustees	Construction, finances, personnel policies, student policies, curricula	Elected for staggered 6-year terms	Multi-campus
Sherwood (M;R)	9-member Sherwood Junior College Board of Trustees	Income & construction (with state board), expenditures , personnel policies, curricula, student policies; adopts policies on the recommendation of the college relating to operation and improvement; sets minimum standards of operation with state board	Appointed by governor with recommendations by the County Board of Public Instruction	Multi-campus
Low				
Manning (B;U)	Board of Trustees	Student policies, academic curricula, personnel policies	(Liason not available)	Multi-campus

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of local board	Role of board	Means of appointment	Type of district
Carter (M;S)	5-member Board of Trustees	Student policies, personnel policies, finances, construction, curricula	Elected by district voters for 4-year terms	Single-campus
Lowell (M;U)	7-member Lowell Community College Board of Trustees	Construction, finances, personnel policies, student policies, curricula	Elected at alternate biennial elections	Multi-campus
Palmerston (M;R)	12-member Board of Trustees	Student policies, expenditures; personnel policies, curricula	4 appointed by governor, 4 by board of education, 4 by county board of commissioners	Single-campus

TABLE 3-4

INSTITUTIONS' BUDGETS, SOURCES OF INCOME, AND EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT*

Institution by socioeconomic level	1967 budget	1971 budget	Source and allocation		Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
			Source	Allocation		
High						
Meade (W;S)	Not available	$ 5,770,072	Federal	$ 411,060	2.8	$712
		$14,465,027	State	4,254,693	29.4	
		junior	Local	4,343,983	30.0	
		college	Tuition	3,338,967	23.1	
		district	Other	979,987	6.8	
		(JCD)	Auxiliary	1,136,337	7.9	
Quanto (W;U-S)	$601,658	$1,611,036[b]	Federal[b]		6.0	
		$1,356,652[c]	State		77.0	
			Tuition		17.0	
			State[c]	$ 978,832	72.0	$332
			Federal sponsored research	54,555	4.0	
			Tuition	268,488	20.0	
			Student aid	54,777	4.0	
Ward (W;U-S)	$1,300,000	$1,390,647	Tuition	$1,326,824	95.4	$800
			Endowments	19,514	1.4	
			Gifts	6,100	.4	
			Auxiliary	38,209	2.8	
Middle						
Kinsey (W;R)	$1,172,535	$3,189,689	Federal		4.5	$925
			State		38.0	
			Local		33.0	
			Tuition		25.0	
Newson (W;R)	$1,361,125	$2,261,339[b]	Federal		6.0	
		$2,490,000[c]	State		50.0	
			Local		15.0	
			Other		26.0	
			Federal	$ 16,461	.7	$1200
			State	1,066,272	47.2	
			Local	344,270	15.0	
			Tuition	662,251	29.3	
			Other	63,108	2.8	
			Student aid	36,126	1.6	
			Auxiliary	72,851	3.2	

Institution by socioeconomic level	1967 budget	1971 budget	Source and allocation		Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
			Source	Allocation		
Walden (W;U-S)	Not available	$6.5 million	Federal		1.0	$790
			State		31.0	
			Local		68.0	
Appleton (M;U-S)	Not applicable	$20,770,492[b] $24,783,553[c] (JCD)	Federal	$ 626,572[b]	3.0	Not available
			State	4,881,378	23.5	
			Local	12,546,170	60.0	
			Tuition	132,805	.6	
			Sponsored research	2,309,808	11.0	
			Other	273,759	1.3	
Foster (M;U)	$1,636,425	$ 4,965,689				
				JCD		
		$14,465,027 (JCD)	Federal	$ 411,060	2.8	$712
			State	4,254,693	29.4	
			Local	4,343,983	30.0	
			Tuition	3,338,967	23.1	
			Other	979,987	6.8	
			Auxiliary	1,136,337	7.9	
Langston (M;U-S)	$3,577,520	$5,769,450	Federal		5.0	$480
			State		25.0	
			Local		70.0	
Shaw (M;U)	$4.8 million	$9,591,291	Federal	$ 197,056	2.1	$615[b] $475[c]
			State	5,382,000	56.1	
			Local	1,322,522	13.7	
			Tuition	1,868,787	19.5	
			Other	820,926	8.5	
Sherwood (M;R)	$2,386,167	$3,803,093[b] $4.9 million[c]	Federal	$ 295,304	7.8	$815
			State	2,590,956	68.0	
			Local	118,661	3.1	
			Tuition	755,878	19.9	
			Other	42,294	.1	
Low						
Manning (B;U)	$2,299,472 (1968)	$4,279,810	Federal	$ 456,711	5.0	$1103
			State	2,614,456	65.0	
			Local	1,208,643	30.0	
Carter (M;S)	$3,060,892	$5,239,490[b] $6,235,511[c]	Federal	$ 220,798	4.2	$666[b] $792[c]
			State	1,385,471	26.4	
			Local	3,097,544	59.0	
			Tuition	14,016	.3	
			Auxiliary	521,661	10.0	

Institution by socioeconomic level	1967 budget	1971 budget	Source and allocation: Source	Source and allocation: Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Lowell (M;U)	$6,837,834	$10,325,289	Federal		69.0	$677
			State		17.5	
			Local		5.0	
			Other		8.5	
Palmerston (M;R)	Not available	$1,121,044[b] $1.4 million[c]	Federal	$ 7,492[b]	.7	$1668[b] $2083[c]
			State	910,286	81.2	
			Local	108,711	9.7	
			Tuition	53,582	4.7	
			Other	40,973	3.7	

*Budget sources and per student expenditures are based on the 1971 budget.

TABLE 3-5

PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND STUDENT-STAFF RATIOS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Instructors		Student-faculty ratio	Counselors	Student-counselor ratio	Total student enrollment
	Number	FTE				
High						
Meade (W;S)	203[c] 246[e] JCD 460 full-time 110 part-time	504 JCD	15/1[c] 30/1[e]	13	563/1[b] 632/1[c]	7,322[b] 8,100[c]
Quanto (W;U-S)	74 full-time 8 part-time 99[c]	77	50/1[b] 41/1[c]	7	583/1[b] 585/1[c]	4,082[b] 4,097[c]
Ward (W;U-S)	46 full-time 3 part-time	47.5	36/1	1	1725/1	1,725
Middle						
Kinsey (W;R)	86	86	41/1[b] 39/1[c]	7	492/1[c] 486/1[e]	3,448[c] 3,402[e]
Newson (W;R)	79 full-time[b] 5 part-time 96[c]	81.5	23/1[b] 20/1[c]	6	250/1[c]	1,990[c]
Walden (W;U-S)	266 full-time 5 part-time	253	30/1[b] 31/1[c]	8	1025/1[b] 1020/1[c]	8,204[b] 8,165[c]
Appleton (M;U-S)	82 daily/hourly 100.48 day/eve		64/1	3	1750/1	5,249
Foster (M;U)	174 JCD 460 full-time 110 part-time	504 JCD	29/1[b] 39/1[c]	14	370/1[b] 490/1[c]	5,190[b] 6,911[c]
Langston (M;U-S)	275		42/1[b] 43/1[c]	14	840/1[b] 855/1[c]	11,772[b] 11,975[c]
Shaw (M;U)	351 full-time[b] 231 part-time 460[c]	400	43/1[b] 39/1[c]	18	593/1[b] 865/1[c]	15,582[b] 19,819[c]

Institution by socioeconomic level	Instructors		Student-faculty ratio	Counselors	Student-counselor ratio	Total student enrollment
	Number	FTE				
Sherwood (M;R)	154 full-time[b] 17 part-time 220[c]	159.7	28/1[b] 25/1[c]	11	368/1[b] 557/1[c]	4,054[b] 6,135[c]
Low						
Manning (B;U)	100		39/1	14	350/1	3,879
Carter (M;S)	128 full-time 149 part-time	184.7[b] 174.5[d]	43/1[b] 45/1[d]	12	650/1	7,865
Lowell (M;U)	261 graded day programs 136.3 extended day programs		38/1[c] 42/1[e]	14	1189/1[c] 1088/1[e]	15,233[c] 16,646[e]
Palmerston (M;R)	32 full-time[b] 6 part-time 35[c]	36	18/1	2	336/1	672[b] 635[c]

TABLE 3-6

EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of evaluation
High	
Meade (W;S)	Formal: in-class experiences, procedures, content, willingness to help, etc.
Quanto (W;U-S)	No systematic evaluation; informal feedback from students.
Ward (W;U-S)	Informal feedback.
Middle	
Kinsey (W;R)	Use of student evaluations when feasible. Faculty hand out questionnaires for each course and talley their own results.
Newson (W;R)	Not written; informal feedback.
Walden (W;U-S)	Student evaluation of courses and instructors each term; committee of students and faculty for instructional evaluation; faculty questionnaire.
Appleton (M;U-S)	Information not available.
Foster (M;U)	Liason not available. Information from junior college district: formal evaluation of in-class experiences, procedures, content, willingness to help, etc.
Langston (M;U-S)	Not mandatory; informal feedback.
Shaw (M;U)	Voluntary option of teacher; not systematic.
Sherwood (M;R)	Three times a year; initiated in 1970-71 as a result of a pilot study on faculty evaluation; evaluation instrument managed by student government association; results in the form of a rating scale for each class section are sent to instructors.
Low	
Manning (B;U)	"Each faculty member shall be evaluated by students in each course"--effective Spring, 1971; administered at end of semester, anonymous. To improve teaching, evaluations are discussed with chairman, faculty, and administration.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of evaluation
Carter (M;S)	One time--student initiated last semester: Twelve questions on IBM cards were processed for each instructor and administered in each class. Next year the evaluations will be regularized to meet a state senate bill requiring evaluation of non-tenured faculty.
Lowell (M;U)	None.
Palmerston (M;R)	Student ratings; ovservation; individual conferences between director of faculty and teacher. Teaching effectiveness measures are then discussed with other administrators.

TABLE 3-7

SOURCES OF STUDENTS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Number of local high schools	Number of high school graduates 1970-1971	Proportion of local high school graduates attending the college	Other sources	Percent
High					
Meade (W;S)	47 Public 49 Private 96 Total	No answer	38	City County Outside JCD Outside state GED graduates Non-graduates Transferees	16.6 49.5 2.5 4.1 3.8 .8 22.7
Quanto (W;U-S)	11	2499 (1969)	29	In JCD Outside JCD Foreign	98.0 1.0 1.0
Ward (W;U-S)	60	approximately 7,000 (1969)	No answer		
Middle					
Kinsey (W;R)	30	4004	No answer	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	81.4 17.4 .5 .6
Newson (W;R)	30	10,921	11.4	In JCD Outside JCD In state Outside state Foreign	79.9 20.1 99.2 .7 .1
Walden (W;U-S)	50	15,000	90		
Appleton (M;U-S)	27	Not available	973 first-time freshmen		
Foster (M;U)	120	35,617	No answer	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state GED graduates Transferees Uncoded	57.9 3.8 10.2 7.4 15.8 4.9

Institution by socioeconomic level	Number of local high schools	Number of high school graduates 1970-1971	Proportion of local high school graduates attending the college	Other sources	Percent
Langston (M;U-S)	32	Not readily available	Not available from known sources		
Shaw (M;U)	48	12,568	22.4	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	76.0 23.0 .86 .09
Sherwood (M;R)	6	1,533	44[c] 22[d]	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	56.0 35.0 3.0 6.0
Low					
Manning (B;U)	12	3,723 (1969)	25	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	85.0 10.0 4.0 1.0
Carter (M;S)	7	2,612[a] from the five high schools in the JCD	42	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	87.0 6.0 1.0 5.0
Lowell (M;U)	64	59,500 (1969)	15	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	70.7 12.1 8.8 3.2
Palmerston (M;R)	5	1,100 (1969)	25	In JCD Outside JCD Outside state Foreign	90.0 8.0 1.0 1.0

TABLE 3-8

ENROLLMENT STATUS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Full time	Part time	Day	Evening	Special	1967 total	1971 total	Percent of increase or decrease 1967-1971
High								
Meade (W;S)	3780	3542	4941	2381	2099	3142	7322[b] 8100[c]	133[b] 158[c]
Quanto (W;U-S)	1555	2527	1662	2435	15	2190	4082[b] 4097[c]	87[b] 86[c]
Ward (W;U-S)	895	830	910	815	Liason not available	2453	1725	-30
Middle								
Kinsey (W;R)	1592	1856	No records kept		25 (EOP)	1518 (1968)	3448[c] 3402[e]	56
Newson (W;R)	1493	69	1562	428	30	1802	1990	10
Walden (W;U-S)	3556	4609	Not available		80% incoming freshmen	8683	8204[b] 8165[c]	-5.5 -6.0
Appleton (M;U-S)	2187	3062	3899	1350	4	Not applicable	5249	Not available
Foster (M;U)	2518	4393	3879	3032	420	6166	6911	12
Langston (M;U-S)	4010[b] 4023[c]	7762[b] 6099[c]	7626	4348	Not readily available	6622	11,772[b] 11,975[c]	78
Shaw (M;U)	9337	6245	10,470	9349	2049	11,637[b] 22,316[c]	15,582[b] 19,819[c]	34[b] -11[c]
Sherwood (M;R)	3171[b] 4825[c]	883[b] 1551[c]	3137	2473	1303	1898	4054[b] 6135[c]	114[b] 223[c]

Institution by socioeconomic level	Full time	Part time	Day	Evening	Special	1967 total	1971 total	Percent of increase or decrease 1967-1971
Low								
Manning (B;U)			Liason not available				3879	Not available
Carter (M;S)	3414	4451	4699[c] 4932[e]	3166[c] 2933[e]	85 (EOP)	6713	7865	17
Lowell (M;U)	5936	9297	5685	9548	331	3916 (FTE)	15,233	52
Palmerston (M;R)	625[b] 621[c]	47[b] 14[c]	605	16	8	359	672[b] 635[c]	87

TABLE 3-9

PROGRAM EMPHASIS AND ENROLLMENT

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students	Number of day courses	Number of evening courses
High							
				b c			
Meade (W,S)	Vocational	14	34.0	895 1221	17.0	281 total	25
	Business	4	9.8	300			29
	Transfer	23	56.0	3055 2922	40.5		86
	Non-credit			172			
	Undecided			3072	42.5		
Quanto (W;U-S)	Vocational	13	62.0	1215	29.7	123 total	122 total
	Business	4	19.0	867	21.2		
	Transfer	4	19.0	2015	49.1		
	Non-credit			15			
Ward (W;U-S)	Vocational	None				98 total	135 total
	Transfer	Most	Liason not available				
	Non-credit						
Middle							
						c e	c e
Kinsey (W;R)	Vocational	16	28.6	851	26.0	62 76	20 15
	Business	3	12.9	535	16.0	20 47	17 31
	Transfer	24	58.0	2062	58.0	119 283	48 57
	Non-credit	3					
				b c			
Newson (W;R)	Vocational	9	26.5	412 363	26.0	282 total	144 total
	Business	5	14.7				
	Transfer	20	58.8	1150 1276	73.0		
	Non-credit			1147 1304			
	Undecided			428			
		c e	c e				
Walden (W;U-S)	Vocational	11 20	25.6 35	1207	14.8	23	13
	Business	3 8	7.0 14			23	32
	Transfer	29	67.4 51	6958	85.0	179	97
	Non-credit	67		2081			
Appleton (M;U-S)	Vocational	14	29.0	1754	33.0	72	23
	Business	6	12.5	849	16.0	27	6
	Transfer	28	58.3	2646	50.0	156	29
	Non-credit	Not available--all courses involve credit					
Foster (M;U)	Vocational	21	37.0			610 total	212 total
	Business	11	19.6	Liason not available			
	Transfer	24	42.9				
	Non-credit	Liason not available					

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students	Number of day courses	Number of evening courses
				overlapping			
Langston (M;U-S)	Vocational	42	47.0	4,641		661	350
	Business	9	10.0	1,463		total	total
	Transfer	38	43.0	22,557			
	Non-credit	Liason not available					
				b c			
Shaw (M;U)	Vocational	24	52.0	169 1880	16.0	72	62
	Business	2	4.3	52 650	5.0	31	15
	Transfer	20	43.5	1205 9231	79.0	204	126
	Non-credit	14		65 7000			
Sherwood (M;R)	Vocational	13	27.5	432	10.7	159	99
	Business	4	8.5	378	9.0	total	total
	Transfer	30	64.0	3244	80.0		
	Non-credit	75		2081			
Low							
Manning (B;U)	Vocational	Comprehensive with strong vocational				30	11
	Business					14	13
	Transfer	Liason not available for further				21	13
	Non-credit	information					
				d e	d e		
Carter (M;S)	Vocational	31	34.0	1706 2423	45 31	22	69
	Business	9	10.0	956 1171	25 15	9	31
	Transfer	51	56.0	408 4201	11 54	28	55
	Undecided			697	19		
	Non-credit	54		3166			
Lowell (M;U)	Vocational	18+	65.0	11,190		152	83
	Business	9	21.0	3,746		total	12
	Transfer	26	13.2	2,267			27
	Non-credit	5					
Palmerston (M;R)	Technical	23	67.6	507	75.4	114	52
	Vocational	10	29.4	160	23.8	total	21
	Special technical	1	2.9	5	.7		32
	Non-credit	26		1682			11

TABLE 3-10

STUDENTS' ACADEMIC APTITUDE AND HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

Institution by socioeconomic level	Mean academic aptitude	Percentage of students at each high school GPA Quartile
High		
Meade (W;S)	No overall admissions tests	Not available
Quanto (W;U-S)	CEEB V=430 M=370	Lower ¼ 10 Lower ½ 50 Upper ½ 20 Upper ¼ 20
Ward (W;U-S)	CEEB M=450 V=400	Lower ¼ 12 Lower ½ 65 Upper ½ 35 Upper ¼ 5
Middle		
Kinsey (W;R)	ACT Composite 18.19 Math 17.57 English 16.48 Nat. Sci. 19.8 Soc. Sci. 18.47	Top 10% 3 25 13 30 45 75 77
Newson (W;R)	ACT = 19	Lower ¼ 20 Lower ½ 32 Upper ½ 29 Upper ¼ 19
Walden (W;U-S)	ACT = 17.8	Lower ¼ 24.7 Lower ½ 31.6 Upper ½ 26.3 Upper ¼ 17.4
Appleton (M;U-S)	Not available	Not available
Foster (M;U-S)	Not available	Not available
Langston (M;U-S)	None used campus-wide	Not available from known sources
Shaw (M;U)	ACT = 16.5 CEEB = 935.1	Lower ¼ 4 Lower ½ 46 Upper ½ 42 Upper ¼ 8

Institution by socioeconomic level	Mean academic aptitude	Percentage of students at each high school GPA Quartile
Sherwood (M;R)	No testing required	Lower ¼ 3 Lower ½ 16 Upper ½ 36 Upper ¼ 45
Low		
Manning (B;U)	ACT = 11 (5th Percentile)	Lower ¼ 10 Lower ½ 55 Upper ½ 25 Upper ¼ 15
Carter (M;S)	SCAT = 35th Percentile	Not available
Lowell (M;U)	Not available	Not available
Palmerston (M;R)	General Army Testing Battery = 95 Differential Aptitude Test = 40	Lower ¼ 25 Lower ½ 32 Upper ½ 33 Upper ¼ 10

TABLE 3-11

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE STUDENT BODIES AND COMMUNITIES (IN PERCENT)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Caucasian	Black	Spanish surname	Oriental	American Indian	Other or not coded
High						
Meade (W;S)						
Students	98	1.5				.5
Community	98	1.5				.5
Quanto (W;U-S)						
Students*						Not available
Community	95.3	2.1	1.9	.7		
Ward (W;U-S)						
Students	91	7	.5	1.0		.5
Community	96	2	1.0			1.0
Middle						
Kinsey (W;R)						
Students*						Not available
Community	90	10				
Newson (W;R)						
Students	97	.9	1.0	.1	.02	.08
Community	98	.8	.7	.5		
Walden (W;U-S)						
Students	90	5.0	4.0	1.0		
Community	88	3.4	3.2	2.0	.2	1.5
Appleton (M;U-S)						
Students	50.89	35.06	3.85	6.67	1.56	1.97
Community*						
Foster (M;U)						
Students	47.5	47.5				5.0
Community	98.0	1.5				.5
Langston (M;U-S)						
Students	39	41.1	6.5	6.6	1.1	5
Community*						
Shaw (M;U)	e	e c	e c			c
Students	48	11 13	40 56			31
Community	55.7	6.6	37.4	.15	.15	
Sherwood (M;R)						
Students	59.1	9.8				31.1
Community	78.5	20.9				.6

Institution by socioeconomic level	Caucasian	Black	Spanish surname	Oriental	American Indian	Other or not coded
Low						
Manning (B;U)						
Students*						
Community	5	92	3			
Carter (M;S)						
Students	86.3	1.9	10.7	.5	.01	.44
Community	85.7	1.7	11.6	.4	.2	.5
Lowell (M;U)						
Students	33.4	38.9	18.5	5.3	1.2	2.7
Community	33.4	38.9	18.5	5.3	1.2	2.7
Palmerston (M;R)						
Students	60	40				
Community	60	40				

*Information not readily available.

TABLE 3-12

GRADUATES AND WITHDRAWALS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Achievements of June '71 graduates			Percentage of withdrawals	
	Associate degrees	Certificates	Transfers to 4-year colleges	Current	Past 5 years
High					
Meade (W;S)	347	47	356[b] 347[c]	9.8[b] 8.9[c]	Not available
Quanto (W;U-S)	148[b] 297[c]	0	149	14	15
Ward (W;U-S)	0	10	335	51	47
Middle					
Kinsey (W;R)	0	5	95	None	Not applicable
Newson (W;R)	111	35[b] 51[c]	380[b] 491[c]	12.2	7.8
Walden (W;U-S)	137[b] 221[c]	200[b] 74[c]	378[b] 1000[c]	Not available	25
Appleton (M;U-S)	101[b] 139[c]	41	79[b] Not available[c]	Not available	Not applicable
Foster (M;U)	337	53[b] 55[c]	358[b] 117[c]	Not available	Not available
Langston (M;U-S)	136[b] 430[c]	109[b] 251[c]	274	Not available	Not available
Shaw (M;U)	0	47	881[b] 608[d]	38	Not available
Sherwood (M;R)	222[b] 323[c]	83[b] 30[c]	355[a] unknown[c]	2	2
Low					
Manning (B;U)	18	0	69	Not available	Not available

Institution by socioeconomic level	Achievements of June '71 graduates			Percentage of withdrawals	
	Associate degrees	Certificates	Transfers to 4-year colleges	Current	Past 5 years
Carter (M;S)	534[a] 620[b]	0[b] 718[d]	462[b] 447[d]	18	18
Lowell (M;U)	755	628	2-3%	Not available	17.6
Palmerston (M;R)	64[b] 70[c]	30[b] 49[c]	0	Not available	Not available

TABLE 3-13

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

Institution by socioeconomic level	Total aid	Percent of institution's budget*	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
			Type	Amount	Number	Percent
High						
Meade (W;S)	$444,238	7.6	Scholarships	$ 26,790	76	15
			Loans	9,250	98	
			EOG	24,056	39	
			NDSL	43,474	185	
			LEEP	17,529	142	
			Work-study	265,518	478	
			Student employment	47,580	65	
			Nursing loan	10,041	25	
Quanto (W;U-S)	$159,370	11.7[b] 9.9[c]	EOG	$ 10,455	26	Not available
			NDSL	7,667	24	
			Work-study	51,198	78	
			Nursing loan & scholarship	26,050	33	
			Cuban refugees	1,000		
			Strengthening developing institutions	11,000		
			Disadvantaged students program	52,000		
Ward (W;U-S)	$29,500	2.1	NDSL	$25,000	Not available	Not available
			Work-study	4,500		
Middle						
Kinsey (W;R)	$142,269[b]	4.5	Grants & scholarships	$25,485	137	12
			Loans	75,624	230	
			Work-study	36,130	60	

Institution by socioeconomic level	Total aid	Percent of institution's budget*	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
			Type	Amount	Number	Percent
Kinsey (cont'd)	$150,000[c]	4.7				
	$195,764[e]	6.0	EOG	$ 15,130	65	9
			Loans	106,899		
			Work-study	56,510	62	
			State scholarship	4,060	12	
			Other scholarships	3,800	19	
			Fund award	5,615	42	
			Borgess Service League	3,750	20	
Newson (W;R)	$154,500	6	EOG	$ 26,000	63	26
			Work-study	70,000	139	
			NDSL	32,000	90	
			Nursing loan	13,000	23	
			Nursing scholarship	11,500	18	
			LEEP	2,000	22	
			Vocational rehabilitation		50	
Walden (W;U-S)	$200,174	3	Work-study	$ 29,063	368 total students on aid	4.5
			State loans	27,200		
			NDEA	516		
			Grants	63,091		
			College service aides	70,134		
Appleton (M;U-S)	$214,185	1	Loans Grants Scholarships		827	16
Foster (M;U)	$143,926[b]	2.8				

Institution by socioeconomic level	Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
			Type	Amount	Number	Percent
Foster (cont'd)	$971,208 (JCD)	3	National Summer Youth Sports	$ 20,500		
			National Science Foundation	5,100		
			MDTA	34,815		
			Allied Health	53,843		
			VEA Amendment	29,424		
			VEA occupational support	257,649		
			Work-study	364,077		
			NDEA	101,900		
			EOG	37,214		
Langston (M;U-S)	$214,185 (JCD)	1 (JCD)	Work-study			
			EOG			
			NDSL			
			Loans			
			Scholarships			
			Liason not available for further information			
Shaw (M;U)	$693,400	7	Work-study	$420,000	1465 total	9.4[b] 7.4[c]
			Loans	192,000		
			Grants/scholarships	81,400		
Sherwood (M;R)	$357,952	8.6[b] 7.0[c]	EOG	$ 43,990		
			Work-study	74,275		
			NDL	117,359		
			LEEP	53,639		
			Nursing scholarship	16,818		
			Nursing loan	21,871		
			Cuban Loan Fund	30,000		

Institution by socioeconomic level	Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
			Type	Amount	Number	Percent
Low						
Manning (B;U)	$465,300[b]	10.9	Scholarships	$ 33,000	52	
			Loans	86,552	141	
			Work-study	307,748	575	
			Nursing loan and scholarship	38,000		
	$623,865[c]	14.6	EOG	$220,000		
			NDSL	60,895		
			NSL	22,000		
			LEEP	4,550		
			Nursing scholarship	14,000		
			Work-study	302,420		
Carter (M;S)	$186,516	3.5[b] 3.0[c]	EOG	$ 27,429	63	8.5
			NDSL	29,705	78	
			Work-study	47,622	327	
			Memorial loan	2,425	25	
			Federal loan	32,635	51	
			LEEP	25,350	46	
			College opportunity grant	15,100	18	
			Scholarships	5,200	55	
			Loans	1,050	2	
Lowell (M;U)	$487,380	5.0	EOG	$ 19,000		6.8
			EOPS	2,000		
			EOPS tutors	43,000		
			Work-study	48,000		
			Federal loan	150,000		
			NDSL	41,380		
			Nursing loan	4,500		

Institution by socioeconomic level	Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
			Type	Amount	Number	Percent
Lowell (cont'd)			Department loans	$ 3,500		
			Student assistants	55,500		
			Scholarships	72,000		
			NDL	38,000		
			Psychiatric technologist	7,500		
			Grants	3,000		
Palmerston (M;R)	$163,385	12	EOG	$ 88,093	170 students total	25
			NDSL	20,000		
			College work-study	32,244		
			Vocational work-study	23,048		

*The institutional budgets are shown in Table 3-4.

TABLE 3-14

NEW MAJORS ADDED IN THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Major by Program
High	
Meade (W;S)	Vocational: Air traffic control, introduction to supermarket management, aviation technology, electrical-electronic technology, horticulture, legal technology, management and supervisory development. Business: Office occupation, college accounting I & II.
Quanto (W;U-S)	Vocational: Environmental technology, inhalation therapy, nursing, radiologic technology, early childhood assistant, dental hygiene, data processing, civil technology, electronics technology, fire science, law enforcement, occupational therapy.
Ward (W;U-S)	None
Middle	
Kinsey (W;R)	School in operation only 3 years - still evolving programs.
Newson (W;R)	Vocational: Agriculture-business, retail merchandising, agricultural production. Business: 9-month clerical program, 9-month secretarial program.
Walden (W;U-S)	Vocational: Electronics, X-ray technology, library technology, hotel-motel management, commercial art, horticulture, mechanical technology, vocational music. Business: Data processing. General: General studies program for disadvantaged students, experimental English.
Appleton (M;U-S)	School only 2 years old - still developing curricula.
Foster (M;U)	11 career programs (not majors as such). Liason unavailable for further information.
Langston (M;U-S)	Vocational: Air conditioning technology, aviation, clothing technology, construction, cosmetology, dental assistance, drafting, dry cleaning, electricity, electronics, food and hotel technology, graphic art, home economics, medical

Institution by socioeconomic level	Major by Program
Shaw (M;U)	25 - no further information given.
Sherwood (M;R)	Vocational: Mid-management, biological parks program, counselor-aide program, audio-tutorial, instruction in health-related programs, dental assistance, fire science, cardiovascular technology, recreation leadership, physician assistance.
Low	
Manning (B;U)	Vocational: Allied Health, nursing education, veterans affairs department. General: Communications media institute, Learning Skills Center, education and human services department, urban studies.
Carter (M;S)	Vocational: Work experience, expanded technical fields with business and industry concerns, automotive technology, merchandising, industrial management, industrial engineering, crafts, computational courses, radiologic technology, expansion of supervision curriculum. Business: Data processing, business education division. General: correctional science, economic history of the U.S., planetarium, microbiology course expansion, English course for terminal level students.
Lowell (M;U)	Vocational: Community initiated curriculum: public works, piping technology; environmental health sciences, computer maintanence, hotel & motel management, travel, inspection technology, numerical controls, graphics, computer technology, operating room technology, plastics and mold making, paramedical "assistant" classes, basic skills, vocational work experience (on-the-job training). Business: General business, data processing. General: Ethnic minorities (history).
Palmerston (M;R)	Vocational: Teachers' assistant program, practical nurse education, electrical, data processing, mental health program.

TABLE 3-15

PROGRAMS AND AID FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Recruitment	Financial Aid
High			
Meade (W;S)	5 Basic Academic Skills programs but none specifically for the disadvantaged		EOG, Work-study
Quanto (W;U-S)	32% academically disadvantaged; liason not available for further information	Through community service programs	EOG, work-study, State Disadvantaged Students program ($52,000)
Ward (W;U-S)	None special 5% academically disadvantaged	None special	Work-study, modest amounts of financial aid plus low tuition meets most needs if applicant can pay half or more
Middle			
Kinsey (W;R)	Basic College Skills; reading skills program	Project "Total Package" recruits from the community through black counselors and referrals	EOP
Newson (W;R)	4% academically disadvantaged Pre-career programs; reading improvement programs	In 9 county areas by 5 counselors and admissions officers visiting area high schools	EOP, work-study, vocational rehabilitation program
Walden (W;U-S)	24% academically disadvantaged General studies	Not much emphasis since school not located in low income part of city; sends counselors to inform the community and high schools of programs, financial aid, athletic programs; tours of campus	EOP, work-study, college service aids

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Recruitment	Financial Aid
Appleton (M;U-S)	49% academically disadvantaged; liason not available for further information	Student recruitment teams provide services to local high schools and to potential students in the community at large; assist in completing admissions forms; give information about programs and services; help solve problems related to orientation to college. Recruitment also by disadvantaged students themselves who gain work experience as recruiters, counselor aides, tutors, teacher aides, etc.	No answer
Foster (M;U)	Not available	Not available	Manpower Development Training Act ($34,815) Vocational Education Act Amendment ($29,424) Vocational Education Act Occupational Program Support ($257,649) EOG ($37,214)
Langston (M;U-S)	Not available[c] quickly Ethnic studies; experimental college; work-incentive program; college readiness program which involves preparatory courses and tutorial programs for those disadvantaged people wishing to enter	Store front activities; recruitment for college readiness program by means of counselors visiting and speaking to junior and senior high school students	Not available[c] quickly EOG, work-study

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Recruitment	Financial Aid
Shaw (M;U)	Guided Studies Program (remedial); compensatory basic studies for those with low ACT scores		EOG, work-study, State Opportunity Plan, all federal student financial aid programs
Sherwood (M;R)	12% academically disadvantaged Transfer freshmen are required to take core basic general education; college parallel and adult general education; Manpower Development and Training Act program; vocational exploration project; continuing education	Outward Bound (recruitment from local high schools); input from Vocational Rehabilitation Service	Vocational Rehabilitation; EOG; work-study; Outward Bound offers financial aid to low income blacks
Low			
Manning (B;U)	86% academically disadvantaged Learning Skills Center; Neighborhood Youth Corps Prep Academy (unemployed youth employability training); Upward Bound; USOE Student Special Services; basic English; general educational development program; Project Impact; college learning resource center	Recruits parolees, discharged servicemen; through speakers, films, public relations, mailings, external newsletter; high school dropout program recruits 100 high school dropouts for work-study	Special services to support minority students in college; Neighborhood Youth Corps ($75,000); Parolee Assistance Program provides funds; work-study; EOG
Carter (M;S)	Actuation center; skills center; Manpower Development Training Program; Vocational Education Act program for the handicapped; basic pre-vocational educational and technical training program; English as a Second Language	Counselors go to local high schools to discuss admissions procedures, programs, financial aid, etc.; screening of high school students for placement in occupationally oriented programs	Vocational Education Act ($1,377) Actuation Center ($75,000) EOG ($27,429) Work-study ($47,622)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Programs	Recruitment	Financial Aid
Lowell (M;U)	College basic skills (remedial for business and transfer students); assistance classes (remedial for vocational students); innovative occupational programs developed at assistant level to improve skills; English as a Second Language; tutoring; multicultural studies; Learning Center	Occupational Advisement (Mobile Advisement Center van goes into community); community agents; tours of campus; mailings to acquaint community with facilities and educational opportunities; counselors visit local high schools; California Vocational Association Fair	EOG; EOPS; Work-study; grants for the disadvantaged; EOPS tutors receive pay
Palmerston (M;R)	50% academically disadvantaged 7 developmental education programs; community advisory board for the educationally disadvantaged (which develops and evaluates programs)	On-campus tours; orientation programs; recruiters and counselors sent directly into community	EOG; Work-study; Vocational Rehabilitation Act; $14,000 in special fund for the disadvantaged; Vocational Education Act for the disadvantaged

TABLE 3-16

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS I*

Institution by socioeconomic level	Median educational level (grade)	Median annual income per family	Proportion of white/blue collar workers	Percent of population of college age (18-23)
High				
Meade (W;S)	12th grade	$11,950	Not available	Not available
Quanto (W;U-S)	11.2	$10,100	45/55	12.8
Ward (W;U-S)	High school graduate	$15,000	60/40	Not available
Middle				
Kinsey (W;R)	12.3	$9,852	Not available	17
Newson (W;R)	Not available	$9,478	Not available	5.21
Walden (W;U-S)	10th grade	$9,750	40/60	12
Appleton (M;U-S)	12.3	$7,500	Not available	16.4
Foster (M;U)	Not available	Not available	Not available	10.3
Langston (M;U-S)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Shaw (M;U)	11.6	$6,346	Not available	7
Sherwood (M;R)	Not available	Not available	Not available	31
Low				
Manning (B;U)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Carter (M;S)	Not available	Not available	Not available	12.35

Institution by socioeconomic level	Median educational level (grade)	Median annual income per family	Proportion of white/blue collar workers	Percent of population of college age (18-23)
Lowell (M;U)	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available
Palmerston (M;R)	9.1	Not available	35/65	4

*See Table 3-11 for the ethnic composition of the communities.

TABLE 3-17

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS II

Institution by socioeconomic level	Economy	Size	Type and number of local colleges	
High				
Meade (W;S)	$3,500,000,000 valuation (JCD)	550 sq. miles 500,000 pop. (city) 1.5 million population (JCD)	4-year	7
			Other junior colleges	None
			Private technical	Not available
Quanto (W;U-S)	$1,020,809,000 valuation (JCD)	1,512 sq. mi. (county) 637,969 population	4-year	6
			Other junior colleges	3
			Private technical	0
Ward (W;U-S)	$1,020,809,000 valuation (JCD)	1,512 sq. mi. (county) 637,969 population	4-year	10
			Other junior colleges	2
			Private technical	2
Middle				
Kinsey (W;R)	$962,000,000 valuation	200,000 pop. (county) 100,000 pop. (city)	4-year	3
			Other junior colleges	0
			Private technical	0
Newson (W;R)	$442,621,000 valuation	4000 sq. miles 730,000 pop. (city)	4-year	1
			Other junior colleges	1
			Private technical	3
Walden (W;U-S)	$2 billion valuation	75 sq. miles (city) 850,000 population	4-year	25
			Other junior colleges	2
			Private technical	2
Appleton (M;U-S)	$1.7 billion valuation	Not available	4-year	4
			Other junior colleges	3
			Private technical	10

Institution by socioeconomic level	Economy	Size	Type and number of local colleges	
Foster (M;U)	$4.5 billion valuation (JCD) $2.1 billion (city)	4600 sq. miles 2.4 million population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	15 2 Not available
Langston (M;U-S)	Liason not available	Liason not available	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	5 4 0
Shaw (M;U)	$445,000,000 valuation	1266 sq. miles 119,389 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	1 Not available Not available
Sherwood (M;R)	$670,660,000 valuation	1247 sq. mi. (county) 830,460 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	6 0 8
Low				
Manning (B;U)	Liason not available	12 sq. miles 530,095 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	1 6 2
Carter (M;S)	$620,614,970 valuation	310 sq. miles 242,000 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	None None None
Lowell (M;U)	$11 billion valuation (JCD)	882 sq. mi. (district) 4,174,300 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	6 2 22
Palmerston (M;R)	$216,992,000 valuation	656 sq. miles 73,900 population	4-year Other junior colleges Private technical	1 3 0

TABLE 3-18

COMMUNITY SERVICES I

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Funds	Percent	
High				
Meade (W;S)	Director of community services	$102,558	1.8	Courses for small businessmen in organization and administration; wastewater treatment (manpower development division); Kinder Series (Sunday afternoon children's programs); Know Your State lecture series; Meade Community College orchestra; social, recreational, cultural non-transfer level courses
Quanto (W;U-S)	Director of community services	$200,000 adult education (self-supporting activity); $52,000 for community services (separate state allotment)	3.8	Center for continuing education and community services; internship program of preparation for college (ESL, community problems, introductory sociology, cultural, industrial and political aspects of the community); cultural and social facilities open to the community (lectures, films, theater, etc.)
Ward (W;U-S)	No director of community services	None		Private school - not community oriented, many students not from the community; in response to needs of community and of the Trustees of Ward Junior College, a separate college was formed offering third and fourth year study in engineering technology leading to B.A. and B.S. degrees
Middle				
Kinsey (W;R)	No director of community services	None		Not available[c] President attends major community meetings; in-district and out of district counselor workshops are held

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Funds	Percent	
Newson (W;R)	Director of community relations and information	Not available		Center for conferences and workshops; speakers bureau; educational and cultural programs sponsored both by the college and by the college in cooperation with community agencies; vocational rehabilitation services
Walden (W;U-S)	Director of community services and adult education	No specific allocations; money from local sources as need arises		Consults with local citizen groups working on community development projects and trys to improve the quality of service of those already so engaged; training of volunteer tutors as teacher aides in reading; continuing education; film series; art fairs; meetings with political candidates; recreation activities; music workshop; children's theater presentations; Focus - series of discussions on current events and subjects of social, economic, and educational interest; Forum - series of speakers from foreign countries; rapport with elementary schools, high schools, human relations groups, and outlying district chambers of commerce
Appleton (M;U-S)	Junior college district community services board	$485,000	2.3	Film series; drug abuse lectures; Appleton College choir and stage band; children's theater; student and faculty speakers bureau; art exhibits; outreach into Asian community: technical assistance and resources for special projects and programs with Chinese Community Council, Human Resources Development, district public schools, and community human relations department for cultural enrichment; housing authority tenant series (managing household budget, etc.); use of school facilities for community organizations; public forum series

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Foster (M;U)	Community relations officer	$127,987	2.6	Plays, concerts, lectures; art exhibits; speakers bureau; facilities open to clubs and community groups; variety of continuing education courses; liason with social and civic groups
Langston (M;U-S)	Director of community services	$284,295 (community services) $841,954 (adult education)	4.9	Store front activities; experimental college; Inner City Project Development Center (resources into two disadvantaged communities); community advisory committee which formulates curricula and activities offered at the Center; extended day division (ungraded college classes)
Shaw (M;U)	No director of community services	$77,607 None for adult education	.8	Liason not available
Sherwood (M;R)	Dean of community education services	$301,000	7.9	Sherwood Vocational Exploration Project (job exploration project concurrent with vocational counseling); learning labs; cultural development activities; two day care centers; on-the-job training of teacher aides in public schools; demonstration of factory manufacture and/or assembly of usable parts; vocational rehabilitation - skill evaluation and instructional programs for disadvantaged male adults (e.g., job entry skills in electronics assembly), institutional management skills for disadvantaged females; summer workshops to explore careers; continuing education to improve skills and for cultural enrichment of the community

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Low				
Manning (B;U)	Vice president of student and community services and continuing education	Liason not available		Project Prep - pre-discharge program at two armed services facilities for servicemen's high school diploma Community tutorial projects Drug education Parolee assistance program Political awareness program Basic English General educational development program Weekend college Prison annex program - in two correctional facilities to continue education in prison and to enable transferance and functioning when parolled Employability training Project Impact (occupational training center) to train unemployed or underemployed residents in five vocational areas Upward Bound - to accelerate the education of fifty 9th and 10th grade inner city high school students Neighborhood Youth Corps summer project provides work-study experience for 100 disadvantaged high school graduates in a special services program (supportive pay, counseling, employability training) Community Resource Data Center gathers and disseminates information to assist community organizations become more aware of community resources; coordinates research projects to improve services and programs available to community;

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Manning (cont'd)				provides continuous evaluation of community needs Cooperative education program - work-study experience for 100 Manning students in a cooperative arrangement with employers in community (pending) Inner City Community College National Consortium Project - faculty, student, administrative representatives of inner city community colleges throughout the country meet to discuss specific problems (pending) Five neighborhood day care centers Project "Future Education Now" - model program of effective education for disadvantaged members of community through services provided by Manning College Learning Resources Center (pending) Mid management program Veteran affairs program St. Charles Program (1971) - extension courses given at state training school for boys with an identical program set up at the college to allow for transfer from the school to Manning Manning College Credit in Escrow - high school students take college level courses Art exhibits - working agreement with city museum to receive educational exhibits for display at the college; cultural program of researching black art All students and faculty urged to work in community (e.g., teacher aides in

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Manning (cont'd)				elementary schools, planners and workers on community councils, etc.) Visits by counselors, faculty, etc. to public clubs and street gangs to ascertain needs and interests Conference of 25 community and social agencies held in order to assess the present services to the community residents and to determine the role the college could play Small Business Institute offers business courses geared to small minority enterprises Weekly review of community relations projects with outside public relations firm which provides an objective overview of the college and community needs Regular contacts with local national media Street Academy - counseling, tutorial work, GED review, technical-vocational training for those in the community who wish to complete their education; educational methods adapted to the needs of the community Speakers bureau - administrators, faculty, and students speak to community social, religious, educational, and political organizations Division of community services and continuing education employes persons indigenous to the community
Carter (M;S)	Dean of community services	$173,510	2.78	Speakers bureau; planetarium; athletics; art exhibits; youth leadership conference;

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Carter (cont'd)				Seminar on police and community relations; Chicano culture week; black profiles week; workshops on community development; Carter is represented in all major service groups in the area and participated with active personnel membership in local chambers of commerce; allied health; power sewing center Periodic check is made of Human Resources Development list of those who need skills training in order to do outreach and plan employability training programs Interrelationships institute - discussions of youth and education, employment, welfare; age and youth dialogue Narcotics Institute - discussions of identification, investigation, search and seizure Community services sub-committee of faculty senate (community lectures, press-media news stories, etc.)
Lowell (M;U)	Director of community services	$125,000	1.2	Occupational advisement - recruits minority 16-18 year olds for short term non-credit classes offered in 9 trades for exposure and motivation Short term non-credit classes for economically disadvantaged adults who could benefit from training in repair and care of auto and home, good grooming, etc. Recreation - playground operation on evenings and weekends on campus

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of community services	Proportion of institutional budget allocated to services*		Community services
		Fund	Percent	
Lowell (cont'd)				Mobile Advisement Center counseling truck hits target areas in inner city and offers college counseling Faculty encouraged to go into industrial fields in the summer to keep up with trade
Palmerston (M;R)	Director of community services	$190,000	1.7	15 including speakers, community pride programs, training of firemen and policemen, education workshops

*The institutional budgets are shown in Table 3-4.

TABLE 3-19

COMMUNITY SERVICES II

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
High			
Meade (W;S)	None	14 continuing education professionals in the city are committed to inter-agency articulation and program development	None
Quanto (W;U-S)	Art museum studio courses; general studies at regional high schools	12 advisory boards for occupational education; advisory board for the disadvantaged; specific program advisory boards	Community surveys for occupational needs, educational needs, needs of the disadvantaged; survey of black community and housing problems; survey of district to set up a branch campus
Ward (W;U-S)	Consortium of Higher Education of 11 area colleges work in cooperative arrangement whereby students take specialized courses off campus (13 course areas) such as civil and industrial engineering, business administration, data processing	The school sets up a program curriculum and then goes to the community to set up advisory board; advisory boards exist for occupational education and for the disadvantaged; active through community agencies such as Community Action Council	None on-going
Middle			
Kinsey (W;R)	13 (further information not available)	Advisory council for career education but with no standing set of members from business and labor	Initial surveys to establish a public vocational school in the district Pharmaceutical research institute sponsored employment research and manpower information service in the district

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
Kinsey (cont'd)			School works closely with state unemployment office Association with Chamber of Commerce Manpower Needs Committee
Newson (W;R)	98 including an electronics course offered in an electronics company	8 for occupational education	Survey to determine occupational curriculum needs; survey of employment needs of the community; survey to gain community feedback on college's responsiveness to community; manpower needs study; comprehensive area manpower planning system (through governor's office)
Walden (W;U-S)	13 including allied health, social service, social psychology, human growth and development, principles of accounting, mechnical technology, hotel-motel management, horticulture	14 for occupational education: one for each technical and occupational curriculum which governs all academic problems and situations pertaining to that curriculum; consist of at least two individuals presently employed in a local industry which employs graduates of the given program; the boards also assure that the demand for graduates of any particular program does in fact exist	For occupational needs, educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged; survey of socioeconomic characteristics of the community; faculty member in the business department is surveying the business curriculum needs based on the community business situation
Appleton (M;U-S)	18 including courses for nurse's aides;	Established for all occupational programs	Difficult to identify since 5 district colleges contribute but two examples are 1) follow-up of occupational progress of

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
Appleton (cont'd)			graduates; 2) study to identify disadvantaged people not now being served by the junior college district
Foster (M;U)	38	Each occupational curriculum has an advisory board of community participants	Liason not available
Langston (M;U-S)	37	Community advisory committee is composed of individuals from the community, students, and staff who formulate curricula and activities offered; advisory committee for the extended day division; 19 advisory boards for occupational education	None
Shaw (M;U)	Not available	There is an advisory board for all career and technically oriented programs; advisory board for the needs of the disadvantaged	None currently
Sherwood (M;R)	Vocational: cooking, keypunching, apprentice plumbing, pipe fitting, sewing, ceramics, aviation ground school, photography Business: introduction to business, shorthand General: economics, individual in the changing environment, state history, humanities, math	12 for occupational education; 12 for the needs of the disadvantaged	Surveys of the educational and occupational needs of the community; survey of the needs of the disadvantaged; semi-annual employment service surveys; survey by faculty of needs of blacks in the community; survey with chamber of commerce on socioeconomic characteristics of the community (1969)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
Low			
Manning (B;U)	Prison Annex Program (courses offered in prison to bridge gap between prison and the community); Project Prep (general studies for predischarge military men); 60 outposts in the community serving educational and vocational needs of black people; on-location settings (e.g., abnormal psychology course offered in mental hospital)	Specialized occupational advisory committee in each occupational area; College Community Advisory Board with community residents, representatives of community groups, and students meet with administrators and faculty to articulate community educational needs, review total technical and occupational offerings of the college, and advise on new requirements and priorities; pre-professional and related curricula advisory board to advise and assist the dean of Careers College; advisory committees with community churches, businesses, and banks involved with school fund raising and recruitment; 8 allied health advisory committees	Community surveys on socioeconomic characteristics, occupational and educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged; survey of community TV viewing preferences for Manning to acquire television time for educational purposes
Carter (M;S)	19 including dynamics of interpersonal relations, fundamentals of supervising, supervisory management, legal aspects of correction, real estate, teacher assistance, fire science, human relations, applied Spanish, autobody and fender	Community advisory boards for occupational education and needs of the disadvantaged; planned program of placement and coordination conferences with business and community leaders; the instructional program is kept current and the latest information on occu-	Survey of socioeconomic characteristics of the community; survey of local manpower needs in cooperation with business, industrial, and community service organizations; survey of those on Human Resources Development list who need skills training for employment

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
Carter (cont'd)	technology, basic counseling, law for the layman	pational requirements is made available to students; advisory boards with representatives from management and labor advise the college in the organization and operation of its various occupational programs; 1 general community advisory board; 20-23 for vocational education	
Lowell (M;U)	Seminars for those in business and industry; 14 apprenticeship classes	All training is carried on with the advice and assistance of local advisory committees and industry consultants; 54 advisory committees for 7 program areas composed of leaders in their field. They meet periodically with the college administration and faculty to evaluate training programs, approve changes, review past accomplishments and forcast trends affecting training and employment; curricula are kept up to date with the changes occuring in industry, business, and the community	Surveys to study the socioeconomic characteristics of the community, occupational and educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged In the formulation of new curricula, questionnaires are developed to survey the business or industry so as to determine what the graduates will actually do on the job, where they may expect to find employment, and future prospects for employment. Project COMSERV was initiated to determine facility requirements for a campus planned and oriented community services center (1970) A strategy for city survival, synthesis or social disintegration with the Department of City Planning (1970)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses offered off campus	Local advisory boards	Special community surveys
Lowell (cont'd)			County Business Patterns (1969) Manpower Needs to 1975 sponsored by the State Department of Employment (1969) "Estimated City Employment, Unemployment, and Labor Force" (1970) Estimated Number of Wage and Salary Workers in Non-Agricultural Establishments By Industry sponsored by the State Department of Industrial Relations (1970)
Palmerston (M;R)	60; some classes are taught in the industrial plants where students are employed	16 local advisory committees in curriculum areas to provide feedback on needs; advisory committees for occupational education and for the disadvantaged	Surveys on the socioeconomic characteristics of the community, occupational and educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged

TABLE 3-20

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
High		
Meade (W;S)	Director of institutional research	The extensive list includes: 1) Follow-up of College Parallel and Career program students--those who completed 1 year and did not return; those who completed 2 years and did not graduate; and a follow-up of 150 graduates. 2) Research to provide data to individual departments on teaching loads, etc. 3) In the process of formulating an Institutional Profile. The data will be routinely collected and published and will include all reports for government agencies; community, student, and faculty information; curriculum plans, services, etc.
Quanto (W;U-S)	No director of institutional research	Cost analyses of programs and students; research on transferees and their progress (follow-up).
Ward (W;U-S)	No director of institutional research (research done via registrar)	Very little. Correlation studies on academic performance; study of attrition rates; studies on how best to teach foreign students.
Middle		
Kinsey (W;R)	No director of institutional research (research done via Dean of Instruction)	Follow-up of College Skills Program
Newson (W;R)	No director of institutional research (research done via Dean of Pupil Personnel Services)	No formalized research. Individual departments do their own research. A students' characteristics profile is done through the Student Personnel Office. A vocational program cost analysis is required by the state auditor.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
Walden (W;U-S)	Office of Research and Evaluation	The Office of Research was established to provide basic data on community needs and student characteristics; assists the college in long-range planning (programming, budgeting, etc.); a faculty committee on evaluation is being developed; a newsletter disseminates information and opinion to faculty. Follow-up study on experimental English 100; cost-accounting study of departments and programs; study of evening programs; study of transfer programs; evaluation of dean's honors program; follow-up of graduates; evaluation of general studies program; study of the effect of probation policy on students. HEGIS; a clearinghouse of information prepares reports on grade distribution, attrition rates, item analysis of exams, etc.; work with ACT to develop a student guidance profile to be used by vocational-technical counselors; surveys of students by doctoral students: social cultural concomitants of achievement; demographic description of students; and psychological correlates of social conditions Study on how well students from blue collar homes see the services of college related to goals and aspiration level; survey of black consciousness and militancy of students in classes
Appleton (M;U-S)	Director of institutional research	Research department is only two years old; limited to student profiles and specialized studies with the individual departments but the information is not readily available.
Foster (M;U)	Dean of institutional research	Study on teaching techniques. Liason not available for further information.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
Langston (M;U-S)	Research coordinator	Department new this year. Liason not available for further information.
Shaw (M;U)	No director of institutional research	Institutional research not formal or systematic--a proposal for a research section was turned down. The Guided Studies program was evaluated; comparative study of the Reading and Skills Center with its first year of operation; self-study completed in 1964 and the next is projected for 1974.
Sherwood (M;R)	Director of institutional research	Member of the League for Innovation in the community college (with the junior college district); member of Community Junior College Inter-Institutional Research Council which coordinates research efforts. Long-range planning; effectiveness of academic programs; effect of the college on the environment and community; project planning and financing; instructional objectives. Dissertations: Post-junior college activities in the community of elected student government officers; examination of faculty development programs in the state's junior colleges. Inter-institutional research: Study related to identification, placement, and curriculum development for academically unprepared students in the state's junior colleges; follow-up study of students who were freshmen in 1966; an "ERIC" set up to compile research studies in junior colleges in the past 5 years; project to ascertain the degree of student rights, freedoms, and involvement in the junior college; composition writing study as a result of an English composition workshop held by the League for Innovation in the Community College at UCLA in 1968; college preferency report in conjunction with a state-wide twelfth grade testing program with high school seniors;

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
Sherwood (cont'd)		survey of post-secondary occupational education involving faculty and administrators of 11 area vocational schools and 27 junior colleges. College research projects: Follow-up study of graduates from 1966-1968; evaluation of Educational Aide Program; Early Childhood Center (preschool programs for children designed and constructed by college students; research on student progress in reading; study of evening students' counseling needs; project to investigate the role of a psychiatric consultant at the college; follow-up study of licensed practical nursing graduates 1959-1969; characteristics study of Fall 1970 students and a comparison with their university counterparts; survey of characteristics and rewarding experiences of the area technical-vocational high school students (training of high school students in vocational programs); study of characteristics of evening students; difficulty analysis of the Common Program (general education) textbooks; graduate follow-up to compile graduate profile; development of evaluation instrument for faculty development. College-endorsed programs: Conceptual cost-accounting model for a community junior college; analysis of selected student opinions about transfer problems; comparative analysis of the administrative structure and performance of community junior colleges in the state; comparison of self-concept, self-acceptance, self-ideal, and self-ideal congruence of university and junior college freshmen; comparison of 16 personality factor scores of paraprofessional and counselor education students for personality factors and predictive counselor effectiveness.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
Low		
Manning (B;U)	Director of institutional research	Study of persistence as related to grades in 1969 (sample of three remedial English courses); attrition as related to placement in various levels of freshman English; geographical survey of the residence patterns of the Fall 1969 students (which led to the development of a weekend program to accommodate time constraints of part-time students); study of the inner-city public school system on the achievement of inner-city students to document the relationships between quality of learning, environment, and student performance (1969); follow-up study of Fall 1969 students who did not return for the spring term. Summer 1970 all-college weekend workshops with community representatives, students, faculty, administrators, and clerical staff to exchange ideas and for professional development; faculty development program by USOE Division of Educational Professional Development to develop more effective lines of communication between faculty, administrators, and students (1970); curriculum development and implementation workshop (1971); Project Co-op to train Learning Resources staff in the development and use of new instructional material; Community Resource Data Center; peer counseling training program; day care center; survey of non-credit adult education; evaluation of non-punitive grading system at the college; study of perceived and ideal student influence in campus affairs; follow-up study of June 1970 graduates to evaluate their progress in pursuing their goals; ACT Institutional Self-Study Abstract to determine students' perceptions of pertinent factors pertaining to the total environment of the college including major, vocational choice, self-estimated progress, student reactions to instructors, faculty encouragement, etc.

Institution by socioeconomic level	Director of institutional research	Self-studies/Institutional research
Carter (M;S)	Institutional research office	Study of enrollment and future trends; descriptive study of FTE and weekly student contact hours, enrollment figures, faculty load; review of student service practices; study of instructional evaluation; investigation of use of and satisfaction with library facilities; survey of student needs; cost-analyses of faculty-student programs; research on temporary problems such as the effect of the present drop policy. In the process of summarizing junior college research literature to provide information to institutional offices and student services; research review on work-study program, and faculty evaluation. Research review on attitude assessment for ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information; eliciting and screening of research reports for the annual AERA convention; participated in the National Conference Toward Educational Development in the Community Junior College; attendance at the meeting of the California Association for Institutional Research.
Lowell (M;U)	Research and Development officer	Follow-up studies of graduates; research on the contemporariness of curricula; cost-analyses of supplies, programs; comparative study of grades with graduates of a four-year college annually; area residence study by major (by zip code area for academic, business, and vocational majors); follow-up of terminating students; 1970-71 study of students perceptions of college (with ETS).
Palmerston (M;R)	No director of institutional research	Liason not available.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

APPLETON

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - Not applicable
Fall 1971 - 5249

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: Not applicable

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full time - 2187
   Part time - 3062
2. Day - 3899
   Evening - 1350
3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 4 (no remedial per se)

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 101[b]; 139[c]
2. Certificates - 41
3. Transfers to 4-year college - 79[b]; not available[c]

E. Grading policy: No F grading

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
Past 5 years - Not applicable

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 27
2. Number of high school graudates 1970-71 - Not available
3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Appleton - 973 first time freshmen

II. Description of Establishment

1964 District started with two colleges
1970 Appleton opened as newest district junior college

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Programs	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	14	29.0	1754	33
Business	6	12.5	849	16
Transfer	28	58.3	2646	50
Non-credit	Not available - all courses involve credit			

B. Number of day courses:

Vocational	72
Business	27
Transfer	156

Number of evening courses:

Vocational	23
Business	6
Transfer	29

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Not applicable since the school is only 2 years old and is still developing curricula

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

- A. Number of instructors: 82 daily/hourly; 100.48 day/evening
- B. Student-faculty ratio: 64/1
- C. Number of counselors: 3
- D. Student-counselor ratio: 1750/1
- E. Student evaluation of faculty: Information not available

V. Students

A. Ethnic composition of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	50.89
Black	35.06
Spanish surname	3.85
Oriental	6.67
American Indian	1.56
Other not coded	1.97

B. Financial Aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$214,185	1.0	Loans Grants Scholarships		827	16

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - Not available
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available

VI. Finances (for junior college district)

A. 1967 budget: Not applicable

1971 budget: $20,770,492[b]
$24,783,553[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 626,572	3.0	Not available
State	4,881,378	23.5	
Local	12,546,170	60.0	
Tuition	132,805	.6	
Sponsored research	2,309,808	11.0	
Other	273,759	1.3	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Community College Board of Governors

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, curriculum, admissions, tenure

C. Local supervisory board: 7-member district board of trustees; elected

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Student policies, personnel policies (hiring, qualifications, remuneration), construction, curriculum, finances

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 12.3 years
2. Median annual income per family - $7,500
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 16.4

B. Ethnic composition of community: Not available

C. Economy of community: $1.7 billion valuation; commercial and industrial

D. Size: Not available

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 4
2. Other junior colleges - 3
3. Private technical institutes - 10

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a junior college district Community Services Board

B. Proportion of budget allocated to institutional services: $485,000 (2.3)

C. Community service activities:

Film series; drug abuse lecture; Appleton College Choir and Stage Band; drama; children's theater; student and faculty speakers bureau; art exhibits; Housing Authority tenant series (managing household budget, etc.); public forum; use of facilities for community organizations; outreach into Asian community: provide technical assistance and resources for special projects and programs with Chinese Community Council, Human Resources Development, district public schools, and the community human relations department for cultural enrichment

D. Courses offered off campus:

18 including in-service training and courses for nurses aides

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Liason not available
2. Recruitment - Student recruitment teams provide services to local high schools and to potential students in the community at large; they assist in completing admissions forms, give information about programs

and services, help solve problems related to orientation to college. Recruitment is also done by disadvantaged students themselves who gain work experience as recruiters, counselor aides, tutors, teacher aides, financial assistance counselors, etc.

3. Financial aid - No answer

F. Local advisory boards: Established for all occupational programs

G. Special community surveys:

Difficult to identify since 5 district colleges contribute but two examples are: 1) Follow-up of occupational progress of graduates; 2) Study to identify disadvantaged people not now being served by the junior college district

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Director of Institutional Research

The research department is only two years old and is limited to student profiles and specialized studies with the individual departments; the information is not readily accessible.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

CARTER

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 6713
Fall 1971 - 7865

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 17

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 3414
Part-time - 4451

2. Day - 4699[c]; 4932[e]
Evening - 3166[c]; 2933[e]

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 85

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 534[a]; 620[b]

2. Certificates - 0[b]; 718[d]

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 462[b]; 447[d]

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 18
Past 5 years - 18

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 7

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 2,612 from the 5 high schools in the JCD

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Carter - 42%

4. Other sources -

In JCD	87%
Outside JCD	6
Outside state	1
Foreign	5

II. Description of Establishment

1916	Carter Junior College of Agriculture added as a department of Carter Union High School District.
1922	Separate Carter Junior College District formed.
1953	Evening college and summer session started.
1960	Moved to new campus constructed by bond from 1957 election

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment		Percent of students	
Vocational	31	34	1706[b]	2423[e]	45[d]	31[e]
Business	9	10	956	1171	25	15
Transfer	51	56	408	4201	11	54
Undecided			697		19	
Non-credit	54		3166			

B. Number of day courses:

Number of day courses:	Vocational	22
	Business	9
	Transfer	28
Number of evening courses:	Vocational	69
	Business	31
	Transfer	55

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Work experience, expanded technical fields with business and industry concerns, automotive technology, merchandising, industrial management, industrial engineering, crafts, computational courses, radiologic technology, expansion of supervision curriculum

Business - Data processing, business education division

General - Correctional science, economic history of U.S., planetarium, microbiology course expansion, English course for terminal level students

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 128 full-time, 149 part-time
184.7 (FTE)[b]; 174.5 (FTE)[d]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 43/1[b]; 45/1[d]

C. Number of counselors: 12

D. Student-counselor ratio: 650/1

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

One time, student initiated last semester. Twelve questions on IBM cards were processed for each instructor and administered in each class. Next year the evaluations will be regularized to meet a senate bill requiring evaluation of non-tenured faculty

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	86.3
Black	1.9
Spanish surname	10.7
Oriental	.5
American Indian	.01
Other not coded	.44

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$186,516	3.5[b] 3.0[c]	EOG	$27,429	63	8.5
		NDSL	29,705	78	
		Work-study	47,622	327	
		Memorial loan	2,425	25	
		Federal loan	32,635	51	
		LEEP	25,350	46	

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
		College Opportunity Grant	$15,100	18	
		Scholarships	5,200	55	
		Loans	1,050	2	

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - SCAT 35th Percentile
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $3,060,892
1971 budget: $5,239,490[b]
$6,235,511[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 220,798	4.2	$666[b]
State	1,385,471	26.4	$792[c]
Local	3,097,544	59.0	
Tuition	14,016	.3	
Auxiliary	521,661	10.0	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Community College Board of Governors

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, curriculum, admissions, tenure

C. Local supervisory board: 5-member board of trustees; elected by district voters for 4-year terms

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Student policies, personnel policies, curriculum, construction, finances

E. Type of district: Single-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 12.35 approximately

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	85.7
Black	1.7
Spanish surname	11.6
Oriental	.4
American Indian	.2
Other not coded	.5

C. Economy of community: $620,614,970 valuation

D. Size: 310 sq. miles
242,000 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - None
2. Other junior colleges - None
3. Private technical institutes - None

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Dean of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $173,510 (2.78%)

C. Community service activities:

Planetarium, athletics, art exhibits, youth leadership conference, speakers bureau, media news stories, community lectures

Workshops on community development, seminar on police and community relations, Chicano culture week, black profiles week

Carter is represented in all major service groups in the area and participates with active personnel membership in local chambers of commerce; Human Resources Development list of those who need skills training checked by Carter periodically in order to do outreach and plan employability training programs; interrelationships institute to discuss youth, education, employment, welfare; narcotics institute discusses identification, investigation, search and seizure; there is a community services sub-committee of the faculty senate

D. Courses offered off campus:

19 including dynamics of interpersonal relations, fundamentals of supervising, supervisory management, legal aspects of correction, real estate, teacher assistance, fire science, human relations, applied Spanish, autobody and fender technology, basic counseling, law for the layman

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Actuation center; skills center; Manpower Development Training Program; Vocational Education Act program for the handicapped; basic pre-vocational educational and technical training program; English as a Second Language
2. Recruitment - Counselors go to local high schools to discuss admissions procedures, programs, financial aid, etc.; high school students screened for placement in occupationally oriented programs

3. Financial iad - Vocational Education Act ($1,377)
   Actuation Center ($75,000)
   EOG ($27,429)
   Work-study ($47,622)

F. Local advisory boards:

Community advisory boards for occupational education and needs of the disadvantaged; planned program of placement, coordination conferences with business and community leaders; the instructional program is kept current and the latest information on occupational requirements is made available to students; advisory boards with representatives from management and labor who advise the college in the organization and operation of its various programs; 1 general community advisory board; 20-23 for vocational education

G. Special community surveys:

Survey of socioeconomic characteristics of the community; survey of local manpower needs in cooperation with business, industrial and community service organizations; survey of those on Human Resources Development list who need skills training to gain employment

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is an Institutional Research Office

Study on enrollment and future trends; descriptive study of FTE and weekly student contact hours, enrollment figures, faculty load; review of student service practices; study of instructional evaluation; investigation of use of and satisfaction with library facilities; survey of student needs; cost-analyses of faculty-student programs; research on temporary problems such as the effect of the present drop policy.

In the process of summarizing junior college research literature to provide information to institutional offices and student services; research review on work-study program, and faculty evaluation.

Research review on attitude assessment for ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information; eliciting and screening of research reports for the annual AERA convention; participated in the National Conference Toward Educational Development in the Community Junior College; attendance at the meeting of the California Association for Institutional Research.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

FOSTER

I. Enrollment

- A. Total: Fall 1967 - 6166
  Fall 1971 - 6911
- B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 12
- C. Type of enrollment:
  - 1. Full time - 2518
    Part time - 4393
  - 2. Day - 3879
    Evening - 3032
  - 3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 420
- D. Number of graduates in June 1971:
  - 1. Associate degrees - 337
  - 2. Certificates - 53[b]; 55[c]
  - 3. Transfers to 4-year college - 358[b]; 117[c]
- E. Grading policy: Standard A-F
- F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
  Past 5 years - Not available
- G. Source of students:
  - 1. Number of local high schools - 120
  - 2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 35,617
  - 3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Foster - No answer
  - 4. Other sources -

In JCD	57.9%
Outside JCD	38.0
Outside state	10.2
GED graduates	7.4
Transferees	15.8
Uncoded	4.9

II. Description of Establishment

1962 City junior college district formed.
1963 Classes started at Foster.
1966 Received full accreditation from regional association.

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Programs	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	21	37.0	Liason not available	
Business	11	19.6		
Transfer	24	42.9		
Non-credit	Liason not	available		

B. Number of day courses: 610 total
Number of evening courses: 212 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

11 career programs (not majors as such). Liason not available for further information.

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 174; JCD: 460 full-time, 110 part time, 504 (FTE)

B. Student-faculty ratio: 29/1[b]; 39/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 14

D. Student-counselor ratio: 370/1[b]; 490/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Liason not available. Information from junior college district: formal evaluation of in-class experiences, procedures, content, willingness to help, comments, etc.

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	47.5
Black	47.5
Spanish surname	0.0
Oriental	0.0
American Indian	0.0
Other not coded	5.0

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$143,926[b]	2.8		(JCD)	Not available	
$971,208 (JCD)	3.0	National Summer Youth Sports	$ 20,500		
		National Science Foundation	5,100		
		MDTA	34,815		
		Allied Health	53,843		
		VEA Amendment	29,424		
		VEA occupational support	257,649		
		Work-study	364,077		
		NDEA	101,900		
		EOG	37,214		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - Not available
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $1,636,425
1971 budget: $4,965,689; $14,465,027 (JCD)

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 411,060	2.8	$712
State	4,254,693	29.4	
Local	4,343,983	30.0	
Tuition	3,338,967	23.1	
Other	979,987	6.8	
Auxiliary	1,136,337	7.9	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Department of Education

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

No policy decisions made--only recommendations to the president and community college council

C. Local supervisory agency: 6-member junior college district board of trustees; elected

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Primary authority over construction, finances, personnel, curricula, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 10.3

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	98.0
Black	1.5
Other not coded	.5

C. Economy of community: $4.5 billion valuation (JCD)
$2.1 billion valuation (city)

D. Size: 4600 sq. miles
2.4 million population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 15
2. Other junior colleges - 2
3. Private technical institutes - Not available

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Community Relations Officer

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $127,987 (2.6%)

C. Community service activities:

Plays, concerts, lectures, art exhibits, speakers bureau, facilities open to clubs, etc.; variety of continuing education courses; liason with social and civic groups

D. Courses offered off campus: 38

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Not available

2. Recruitment - Not available

3. Financial aid - Manpower Development Training Act ($34,815)
Vocational Education Act Amendment ($29,424)
Vocational Education Act for Occupational Program Support ($257,649)
EOG ($37,214)

F. Local advisory boards:

Each occupational curriculum has an advisory board of community participants

G. Special community surveys: Liason not available

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Dean of Institutional Research

Study on teaching techniques. Liason not available for further information.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

KINSEY

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1968 - 1518
Fall 1971 - 3448^c
3402^e

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1968 to Fall 1971: 54

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 1592
Part-time - 1856

2. Day - No records kept
Evening - No records kept

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 25

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 0

2. Certificates - 5

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 95

E. Grading policy: No penalty grading

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - None
Past 5 years - Not applicable

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 30

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 4004

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Kinsey - No answer

4. Other sources - In JCD 81.4%
Outside JCD 17.4
Outside state .5
Foreign .6

II. Description of Establishment

1966 Board of trustees elected
1968 Classes started

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	16	28.6	851	26
Business	3	12.9	535	16
Transfer	24	58.0	2062	58
Non-credit	3			

B. Number of day courses: Vocational 62^c; 76^e
Business 20^c; 47^e
Transfer 119^c; 283^e

Number of evening courses: Vocational 20^c; 15^e
Business 17^c; 31^e
Transfer 48^c; 57^e

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

School in operation only 3 years and is still evolving programs.

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 86

B. Student-faculty ratio: 41/1[b]; 39/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 7

D. Student-counselor ratio: 492/1[c]; 486/1[e]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

"Use of student evaluations when feasible." Faculty hands out questionnaires for each course and talley their own results.

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent): Not available

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$142,269[b]	4.5	Grants & scholarships	$ 25,485	137	12
		Loans	75,624	230	
		Work-study	36,130	60	
$150,000[c]	4.7				
$195,764[e]	6.0	BOG	$ 15,130	65	9
		Loans	106,899		
		Work-study	56,510	62	
		State scholarship	4,060	12	
		Other scholarships	3,800	19	
		Fund Award	5,615	42	
		Borgess Service League	3,750	20	

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - ACT:

Composite	18.19
Math	17.57
English	16.48
Nat. Sci.	19.8
Soc. Sci.	18.47

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Top 10%	3
Top 25%	13
Top 30%	45
Top 75%	77

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $1,172,535
1971 budget: $3,189,689

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 127,588	4	$925
State	1,212,082	38	
Local	1,052,597	33	
Tuition	797,422	25	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Department of Education proposed constitutional amendment to set up state board for higher education; State Board for Public Junior and Community Colleges and Bureau of Higher Education

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Program approval; sets minimum teaching load, minimum tax assessment; appoints community advisory boards; establishes educational planning district and coordinating council

C. Local supervisory agency: 7-member board of trustees elected by district voters

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Personnel policies, admissions, facilities development

E. Type of district: Single campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 12.3
2. Median annual income per family - $9,852
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 17%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	90
Black	10

C. Economy of community: $962,000,000 valuation

D. Size: 200,000 population (county)
100,000 population (city)

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 3
2. Other junior colleges - 0
3. Private technical institutes - 0

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is no Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: None

C. Community service activities: Not available; president attends major community meetings; in-district and out-of-district counselor workshops are held

D. Courses offered off campus: 13 (further information not available)

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - basic college skills; reading skills program

2. Recruitment - project "Total Package" recruits from the community through black counselors and referrals

3. Financial aid - EOP

F. Local advisory boards:

Advisory council for career education; no standing set of members from business and labor

G. Special community surveys:

Initial surveys to establish a public vocational school in the district; Pharmaceutical research institute sponsored employment research and manpower information service in the district; Kinsey works closely with the state unemployment office; work with chamber of commerce manpower needs committee

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

No Director of Institutional Research (research done via Dean of Instruction)

Follow-up of College Skills Program

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

LANGSTON

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 6622
Fall 1971 - 11,772[b]
11,975[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 78

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 4010[b]; 4023[c]
Part-time - 7762[b]; 6099[c]

2. Day - 7626
Evening - 4348

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - Not readily available

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 136[b]; 430[c]

2. Certificates - 109[b]; 251[c]

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 274

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
Past 5 years - Not available

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 32

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - Not readily available

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Langston - not available from known sources

II. Description of Establishment

1948 Langston Trade and Technical Institute started by city board of education.
1953 Renamed City College.
1964 Renamed Langston when junior college district formed.

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
			overlapping	
Vocational	42	47	4,641	
Business	9	10	1,463	
Transfer	38	43	22,557	
Non-credit	Liason not available			

B. Number of day courses: 661 total
Number of evening courses: 350 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Air conditioning technology, aviation, clothing technology, construction, cosmetology, dental assistance, drafting, dry cleaning, electricity, electronics, food and hotel technology, graphic art, home economics, medical assisting, mechanics, metal and machine, photography, shoe rebuilding

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 275

B. Student-faculty ratio: 42/1[b]; 43/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 14

D. Student-counselor ratio: 840/1[b]; 855/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Not mandatory; informal feedback

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	39.
Black	41.
Spanish surname	6.
Oriental	6.
American Indian	1.
Other not coded	5.

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$214,185 (JCD)	1 (JCD)	Work-study EOG NDSL Federal loans Scholarships	Liason not available for further information		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - None used campus-wide
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available from known sources

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $3,577,520
1971 budget: $5,769,450

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 288,473	5	$480
State	1,442,362	25	
Local	4,038,615	70	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Community College Board of Governors

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, curriculum, admissions, tenure

C. Local supervisory agency: 7-member district board of trustees; elected

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Student policies, personnel policies, curriculum, construction, finances

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - Not available

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent): Not readily available

C. Economy of community: Liason not available

D. Size: Liason not available

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 5
2. Other junior colleges - 4
3. Private technical institutes - 0

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $284,295 (4.9%)

C. Community service activities:

Store front activities; experimental college; Inner City Project Development Center (resources into two disadvantaged communities); community advisory committee (individuals from community, students, and staff formulate curriculum and activities offered at the Center; extended day division (ungraded college classes)

D. Courses offered off campus: 37

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Not available quickly[c]; ethnic studies, experimental college, work incentive program, college readiness program which involves preparatory courses and tutorial programs for those disadvantaged people wanting to enter[e]

2. Recruitment - Store front activities; recruitment for college readiness program by means of counselors visiting and speaking to junior and senior high school student

3. Financial aid - Not available quickly[c]; EOG, work-study

F. Local advisory boards:

Community advisory committee is composed of individuals from the community, students, and staff who formulate curricula and activities offered; advisory committee for the extended day division; 19 advisory boards for occupational education

G. Special community surveys: None

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Research Coordinator

Department new this year. Liason not available for further information.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

LOWELL

I. Enrollment

- A. Total: Fall 1967 - 3916 (FTE)
  Fall 1971 - 5936 (FTE); 15,233 (total)
- B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 52
- C. Type of enrollment:
  - 1. Full time - 5936
    Part time - 9297
  - 2. Day - 5685
    Evening - 9548
  - 3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 331
- D. Number of graduates in June 1971:
  - 1. Associate degrees - 755
  - 2. Certificates - 628
  - 3. Transfers to 4-year college - 2-3%
- E. Grading policy: Standard A-F
- F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
  Past 5 years - 17.6%
- G. Source of students:
  - 1. Number of local high schools - 64
  - 2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 59,500
  - 3. Proportion of local high school graudates attending Lowell - 15%
  - 4. Other sources -

In JCD	70.7%
Outside JCD	12.1
Outside state	8.8
Foreign	3.2

II. Description of Establishment

1920	Series of conferences by education, city, industry, and labor; began with class in power sewing
1927	Board of Education established present school; called a trade school and then a trade institute
1949	Board of Education established Lowell as a junior college offering A.A. and A.S. degrees
1957	Present site opened
1966	Lowell merged its business and data processing curriculum with another metropolitan college
1969	Lowell became part of the city community college district with an elected board of trustees

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Programs	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	18 + apprenticeships	65	11,190	
Business	9	21	3,746	
Transfer	26	13.2	2,267	
Non-credit	5			

B. Number of day courses: 152 (total)

Number of evening courses: Vocational 83
Business 12
Transfer 27

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - community initiated curriculum: public works, piping technology; environmental health sciences, computer maintanence, hotel-motel management, travel, inspection technology, numerical controls, graphics, computer technology, operating room technology, plastics and mold making, paramedical "assistant" classes, basic skills classes, vocational work experience (on-the-job training)

Business - business and data processing

General - ethnic minorities (history)

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 261 graded day programs; 136.3 extended day

B. Student-faculty ratio: 38/1^c; 42/1^e

C. Number of counselors: 14

D. Student-counselor ratio: 1189/1^c; 1088/1^e

E. Student evaluation of faculty: None

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	33.4
Black	38.9
Spanish surname	18.5
Oriental	5.3
American Indian	1.2
Other not coded	2.7

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$487,380	5.0	EOG	$ 19,000	40	6.8
		EOPS	2,000	10	
		EOPS tutors	43,000	70	
		Work-study	48,000	35	

B. Financial aid (cont'd):

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
		Federal loans	$150,000	278	
		NDSL	41,380		
		Nursing loan	4,500	6	
		Department loans	3,500	72	
		Student assistants	55,500	53	
		Scholarships	72,000	200	
		NDL	38,000	90	
		Psychiatric technologist	7,500	12	
		Grants	3,000	166	

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - Not available
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $6,837,834
1971 budget: $10,325,289

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$7,124,449	69.0	$677
State	1,806,926	17.5	
Local	516,264	5.0	
Other	877,650	8.5	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Community College Board of Governors

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Tenure, construction; occupational curriculum, income, and expenditures (with local board)

C. Local supervisory agency: 7-member community college board of trustees; elected at alternate biennial elections

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, personnel policies, curriculum, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - Not available

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	33.4
Black	38.9
Spanish surname	18.5
Oriental	5.3
American Indian	1.2
Other not coded	2.7

C. Economy of community: $11,306,000,000 valuation

D. Size: 882 sq. miles (district)
4,174,300 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 6
2. Other junior colleges - 2
3. Private technical institutes - 22

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to institutional services: $125,000 (1.2%)

C. Community service activities:

1) occupational advisement (recruitment 16-18 year olds into short-term non-credit classes offered in 9 trades for exposure and motivation);
2) short-term non-credit classes for economically disadvantaged adults;
3) playground operation evenings and weekends on campus;
4) Mobile Advisement Center counseling van offers college counseling in target areas of inner city

Lowell encourages teachers to go into industrial fields in the summer to keep up with trade

D. Courses offered off campus:

Seminars for those in business and industry; 14 apprenticeship classes

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - 1) College Basic Skills (remedial for business and transfer students; 2) assistance classes (remedial for vocational students; 3) innovative occupational programs developed at assistant level to improve skills; 4) classes offered Friday evening and Saturday to provide fuller use of facilities; 5) tutoring; 6) English as a Second Language; 7) multi-cultural studies; 8) Learning Center

2. Recruitment - Occupational advisement; Mobile Advisement Center van for black and Mexican-American students; community agents, buses to campus, mailings to acquaint community with facilities and educational opportunities; personal contact by counselors visiting local high schools; State Vocational Association Fair

3. Financial aid - EOG; EOPS; work-study; grants for the disadvantaged; EOPS tutors receive pay

F. Local advisory boards:

All training is carried on with the advice and assistance of local advisory committees and industry consultants. There are 54 for 7 program areas composed of leaders in their field. They meet periodically with the college administration and faculty to evaluate training programs, approve changes, review past accomplishments and forcast trends affecting training and employment; curriculum is kept up to date with the changes occuring in industry, business, and the community

G. Special community surveys:

Surveys to study the socioeconomic characteristics of the community, occupational and educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged. In the formulation of new curricula, questionnaires are developed to survey the business or industry so as to determine what the graduates will actually do on the job, where they may expect to find employment, and future prospects for employment.

Project COMSERV to determine facility requirements for a campus planned and oriented community services center (1970)

A strategy for city survival, synthesis or social disintegration with the Department of City Planning (1970)

County business patterns (1969)

Study of manpower needs to 1975 sponsored by the State Department of Employment (1969)

"Estimated Employment, Unemployment, and Labor Force" (1970)

"Estimated Number of Wage and Salary Workers in Non-Agricultural Establishments by Industry" sponsored by the State Department of Industrial Relations (1970)

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Research and Development Officer

Follow-up studies of graduates; research on the contemporariness of curricula; cost-analyses of supplies, programs; comparative study of grades with graduates of a four-year college annually; area residence study by major (by zip code area for academic, business, and vocational majors); follow-up of terminating students; study of students' perceptions of college (1970)

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

MANNING

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - Liason not available
Fall 1971 - 3879

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971 - Not available

C. Type of enrollment: Liason not available

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 18
2. Certificates - 0
3. Transfers to 4-year college - 69

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Liason not available

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 12
2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 3,723
3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Manning - 25%
4. Other sources -

In JCD	85%
Outside JCD	10
Outside state	4
Foreign	1

II. Description of Establishment

1969 College opened under another name
1971 Opened as Manning College in response to student demands for change

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A. Comprehensive with strong vocational emphasis; liason not available for further information

B.

Number of day courses:	Vocational	30
	Business	14
	Transfer	21
Number of evening courses:	Vocational	11
	Business	13
	Transfer	13

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Allied health, nursing education, veterans affairs department

General - Communications media institute, learning skills center, education and human services department, urban studies

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 100

B. Student-faculty ratio: 39/1

C. Number of counselors: 14

D. Student-counselor ratio: 350/1

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

"Each member of faculty shall be evaluated by students in each course"--effective spring 1971; end of semester, anonymous. To improve teaching, evaluations are discussed with chairman, faculty, administration

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent): Not available

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$465,300[b]	10.9	Scholarships	$ 33,000	52	
		Loans	86,552	141	
		Work-study	307,748	575	
		Nursing loan & scholarship	38,000		
$623,865	14.6	EOG	$220,000		
		NDSL	60,895		
		NSL	22,000		
		LEEP	4,550		
		Nursing scholarship	14,000		
		Work-study	302,420		

C. Students' ability

1. Mean academic ability scores - ACT 5th percentile
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	10%
Lower ½	55
Upper ½	25
Upper ¼	15

VI. Finances

A. 1968 budget: $2,299,472
1971 budget: $4,279,810

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 456,711	5	$1103
State	2,614,456	65	
Local	1,208,643	30	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Board of Higher Education

B. Role of state in policy decisions:
Construction, finances, occupational curriculum

C. Local supervisory agency: Board of trustees

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:
Personnel policies, academic curriculum, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - Not available

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	5
Black	92
Spanish surname	3

C. Economy of community: Liason not available

D. Size: 12 sq. miles (city)
530,095 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 1
2. Other junior colleges - 6
3. Private technical institutes - 2

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Vice President of Student and Community Services and a Dean of Community Services and Continuing Education

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: Liason not available

C. Community service activities:

Project Prep - pre-discharge program at two armed services facilities for servicemen's high school diploma

Community tutorial projects; drug education; parolee assistance program; political awareness program; basic English; general educational development program; weekend college; employability training

Prison annex program - in two correctional facilities to continue education in prison and to enable transferance and functioning when parolled

Project Impact - occupational training center to train unemployed and underemployed residents in five vocational areas

Upward Bound - to accelerate the education of fifty 9th and 10th grade inner city high school students

C. Community service activities (cont'd):

Neighborhood Youth Corps summer project provides work-study experience for 100 disadvantaged high school graduates in a special services program (supportive pay, counseling, employability training)

Community Resources Data Center gathers and disseminates information to assist community organizations become more aware of community resources; coordinates research projects to improve services and programs available to community; provides continuous evaluation of community needs

Cooperative education program - work-study experience for 100 Manning students in a cooperative arrangement with employers in community (pending)

Inner City Community College National Consortium Project - faculty, student, administrative representatives of inner city community colleges throughout the country meet to discuss specific problems (pending)

Five neighborhood day care centers

Project "Future Education Now" - model program of effective education for disadvantaged members of community through services provided by Manning College Learning Resources Center (pending)

Mid-management program; veterans affairs program

St. Charles Program (1971) - extension courses given a state training school for boys with an identical program set up at the college to allow for transfer from the school to Manning

Manning College Credit in Escrow - high school students take college level courses

Art exhibits - working agreement with city museum to receive educational exhibits for display at the college; cultural program of researching black art

All students and faculty urged to work in community (e.g., teacher aides in elementary schools, planners and workers on community councils, etc.)

Visits by counselors, faculty, etc. to public clubs and street gangs to ascertain needs and interests

Conference of 25 community and social agencies held in order to assess the present services to the community residents and to determine the role the college could play

Small Business Institute offers business courses geared to small minority enterprises

Weekly review of community relations projects with outside public relations firm which provides an objective overview of the college and community needs

Regular contacts with local national media

Street Academy - counseling, tutorial work, GED review, technical-vocational training for those in the community who wish to complete their education; educational methods adapted to the needs of the community

Speakers bureau - administrators, faculty, and students speak to community social, religious, educational, and political organizations

Division of community services and continuing education employs persons indigenous to the community

D. Courses offered off campus:

Prison Annex Program (courses offered in prison to bridge gap between prison and the community)

Project Prep (general studies for pre-discharge military men)

60 outposts in the community serving educational and vocational needs of black people; on-location settings, e.g., abnormal psychology offered at a mental hospital

E. Programs and aid for the disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Learning Skills Center; Neighborhood Youth Corps Prep Academy (unemployed youth employability training); Upward Bound; USOE student special services; basic English; general educational development program; Project Impact; College Learning Resources Center

2. Recruitment - Recruits parolees, discharged servicemen; through speakers, films, public relations, mailings, external newsletter; high school dropout program recruits 100 high school dropouts for work-study

3. Financial aid - Special services to support minority students in college; Neighborhood Youth Corps ($75,000); Parolee Assistance Program provides funds; work-study; EOG

F. Local advisory boards:

Specialized occupational advisory committee in each occupational area; College Community Advisory Board with community residents, representatives of community groups and students meet with administrators and faculty to articulate community educational needs, review total technical and occupational offerings of the college and advise on new requirements and priorities; pre-professional and related curricula advisory board to advise and assist the dean of Careers College; advisory committees with community churches, businesses, and banks involved with school fund raising and recruitment; 8 Allied Health advisory committees

G. Special community surveys:

Community surveys on socioeconomic characteristics, occupational and educational needs and needs of the disadvantaged; survey of community television viewing preferences for Manning to acquire television time for educational purposes

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Director of Institutional Research

Study of persistence as related to grades in 1969 (sample of three remedial English courses); attrition as related to placement in various levels of freshman English; geographical survey of the residence patterns of the Fall 1969 students (which led to the development of a weekend program to accommodate time constraints of part-time students); study of the inner-city public school system on the achievement of inner-city students to document the relationships between quality of learning, environment, and student performance (1969); follow-up study of Fall 1969 students who did not return for the spring term.

Summer 1970 all-college weekend workshops with community representatives, students, faculty, administrators, and clerical staff to exchange ideas and for professional development; faculty development program by USOE Division of Educational Professional Development to develop more effective communication between faculty, administrators, and students (1970);

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research (cont'd)

Curriculum development and implementation workshop (1971); Project Co-op to train Learning Resources staff in the development and use of new instructional material; Community Resources Data Center; peer counseling training program; day care center; survey of non-credit adult education; evaluation of non-punitive grading system at the college; study of perceived and ideal student influence in campus affairs; follow-up study of June 1970 graduates to evaluate their progress in pursuing their goals; ACT Institutional Self-Study Abstract to determine students' perceptions of pertinent factors pertaining to the total environment of the college including major, vocational choice, self-estimated progress, student reactions to instructors, faculty encouragement, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

MEADE

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 3142
Fall 1971 - 7322[b]; 8100[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 133[b]; 158[c]

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 3780
Part-time - 3542

2. Day - 4941
Evening - 2381

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 2099

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 347

2. Certificates - 47

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 356[b]; 347[c]

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 9.8[b]; 8.9[c]
Past 5 years - Not available

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 96

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - No answer

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Meade - 38%

4. Other sources -

City	16.6%
County	49.5
Outside JCD	2.5
Outside state	4.1
GED graduates	3.8
Non-graduates	.8
Transferees	22.7

II. Description of Establishment

1964 Meade established
1966 Joined regional association

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment		Percent of students
Vocational	14	34.0	895[b]	1221[c]	17.0
Business	4	9.8	300		
Transfer	23	56.0	3055	2922	40.5
Non-credit			172		
Undecided			3072		42.5

B. Number of day courses: 281 total

Number of evening courses:

Vocational	25
Business	29
Transfer	86

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational: Air traffic control, introduction to supermarket management, aviation technology, electrical-electronic technology, horticulture, legal technology, management and supervisory development

Business: Office occupation, college accounting I and II

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 203[c]; 246[e]
460 full-time, 110 part-time, FTE 504 (JCD)

B. Student-faculty ratio: 15/1[c]; 30/1[e]

C. Number of counselors: 13

D. Student-counselor ratio: 563/1[b]; 623/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Formal--in-class experiences, procedures, content, willingness to help, etc.

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	98.0
Black	1.5
Other not coded	.5

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$444,238	7.6	Scholarships	$ 26,790	76	15
		Loans	9,250	98	
		EOG	24,056	39	
		NDSL	43,474	185	
		LEEP	17,529	142	
		Work-study	265,518	478	
		Student employment	47,580	65	
		Nursing loan	10,041	25	

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - No overall admissions tests
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile - Not available

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: Not available
1971 budget: $5,770,072
$14,465,027 (JCD)

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 411,060	2.8	$712
State	4,254,693	29.4	
Local	4,343,983	30.0	
Tuition	3,338,967	23.1	
Other	979,987	6.8	
Auxiliary	1,136,337	7.9	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Department of Education

B. Role of state in policy decisions: minimal[c] (no further information given)

C. Local supervisory agency: Board of trustees of junior college district; elected--2 from city, 4 from county for 6-year terms

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Primary authority over construction, finances, personnel, curricula, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 12th grade
2. Median annual income per family - $11,950
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - Not available

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	98.0
Black	1.5
Other not coded	.5

C. Economy of community: $3,500,000,000 valuation (JCD)

D. Size: 550 sq. miles
500,000 population (city)
1,500,000 population (JCD)

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 7
2. Other junior colleges - None
3. Private technical institutes - Not available

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $102,558 (1.8%)

C. Community service activities:

Start courses for small businessmen in organization and administration and income tax; wastewater treatment manpower development division; kinder series of Sunday afternoon children's programs; Know Your State lecture series; Meade Community College orchestra; social, recreational, cultural non-transfer level courses

D. Courses offered off campus: None

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - There are 5 basic academic skills programs but none specifically for the disadvantaged
2. Recruitment - No answer
3. Financial aid - EOG; work-study

F. Local advisory boards:

14 continuing education professionals in the city are committed to interagency articulation and program development

G. Special community surveys: None

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Director of Institutional Research

Follow-up of College Parallel and Career Programs--those who completed 1 year and did not return; those who completed 2 years and did not graduate; and follow-up of 150 graduates

Research to provide data to individual departments on teaching loads, etc.

In process of formulating an Institutional Profile. The data will be routinely collected and published and will include all reports for government agencies; community, student, and faculty information; curriculum plans, services, etc.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

NEWSON

I. Enrollment

   A. Total: Fall 1967 - 1802
   Fall 1971 - 1990

   B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 10

   C. Type of enrollment:

      1. Full-time - 1493
      Part-time - 69

      2. Day - 1562
      Evening - 428

      3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 30

   D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

      1. Associate degrees - 111

      2. Certificates - 35[b]; 51[c]

      3. Transfers to 4-year college - 380[b]; 491[c]

   E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

   F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 12.2
   Past 5 years - 7.8

   G. Source of students:

      1. Number of local high schools - 30

      2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 10,921

      3. Proportion of local high school graduates attedning Newson - 11.4%

      4. Other sources -

In JCD	79.9%
Outside JCD	20.1
In state	99.2
Outside state	.7
Foreign	.1

II. Description of Establishment

1916 Public junior college organized by high school PTA
1918 Opened as City Junior College
1966 City college district formed

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

   A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment		Percent of students
Vocational	9	26.5	412[b]	363[c]	26
Business	5	14.7			
Transfer	20	58.8	1150	1276	73
Non-credit			1147	1304	
Undecided				428	

   B. Number of day courses: 282 total
   Number of evening courses: 144 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Agriculture-business, retail merchandising, agriculture production

Business - 9-month clerical program; 9-month secretarial program

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 79 full-time, 5 part-time, FTE 81.5[b]
96[c]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 23/1[b]; 20/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 6

D. Student-counselor ratio: 250/1

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Not written; informal feedback

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	97.0
Black	.9
Spanish surname	1.0
Oriental	.1
American Indian	.02
Other not coded	.08

B. Financial aid

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$154,500	6	EOG	$26,000	63	26
		Work-study	70,000	139	
		NDSL	32,000	90	
		Nursing loan	13,000	23	
		Nursing scholarship	11,500	18	
		LEEP	2,000	22	
		Vocational rehabilitation		50	

C. Students' ability

1. Mean academic ability scores - ACT 19

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	20%
Lower ½	32
Upper ½	29
Upper ¼	19

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $1,361,125

1971 budget: $2,261,339[b]
2,490,000[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal[b]	$ 16,461	.7	$1600
State	1,066,272	47.2	
Local	344,270	15.0	
Tuition	662,251	29.3	
Other	63,108	2.8	
Student aid	36,126	1.6	
Auxiliary	72,851	3.2	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Department of Public Instruction

B. Role of state in policy decisions.

General overall control; approves curriculum, certification of teachers; approves budget, state aid

C. Local supervisory agency: 11-member board of directors elected by district voters

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, personnel policies, student policies, curriculum

E. Type of district: Single-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - $9,478
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 5.21%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	98.0
Black	.8
Spanish surname	.7
Oriental	.5

C. Economy of community: $442,621,000 valuation

D. Size: 4000 sq. miles
730,000 population (city)

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 1
2. Other junior colleges - 1
3. Private technical institutes - 3

IX. Community Related Activities

- A. There is a Director of Community Relations and Information
- B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: Not available
- C. Community service activities:

  Center for conferences and workshops; speakers bureau; educational and cultural programs sponsored both by the college and by the college in cooperation with community agencies; vocational rehabilitation services
- D. Courses offered off campus:

  98 including an electronics course offered in an electronics company
- E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 4% academically disadvantaged
  1. Programs - Pre-career programs; reading improvement programs
  2. Recruitment - In 9 county areas by 5 counselors and admissions officers visiting area high schools
  3. Financial aid - EOP, work-study, vocational rehabilitation program
- F. Local advisory boards:

  8 for occupational education
- G. Special community surveys:

  Survey to determine occupational curriculum needs; employment needs of the community; survey to gain community feedback on college's responsiveness to community; manpower needs study; survey of comprehensive area manpower planning system (through governor's office)

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

No Director of Institutional Research

No formalized research. Dean of Pupil Personnel Services is responsible for research. Individual departments do their own research. A students' characteristics profile is done through the Student Personnel Office; vocational program cost-analysis is required by the state auditor

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

PALMERSTON

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 359
Fall 1971 - 672[b]; 635[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 87

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 625[b]; 621[c]
Part-time - 47[b]; 14[c]

2. Day - 605
Evening - 16

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 8

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 64[b]; 70[c]

2. Certificates - 30[b]; 49[c]

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 0

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
Past 5 years - Not available

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 5

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 1,100

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Palmerston - 25%

4. Other sources -

In JCD	90%
Outside JCD	8
Outside state	1
Foreign	1

II. Description of Establishment

1961 Chartered as result of bond issue in 1960
1964 Designated as a technical institute by state board of education

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Technical	23	67.6	507	75.4
Vocational	10	29.4	160	23.8
Special technical	1	2.9	5	.7
Non-credit	26		1682	

B. Number of day courses: 114 total

Number of evening courses:

Technical	52
Vocational	21
Special technical	32
Non-credit	11

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational Teachers assistant program, practical nurse education, electrician, data processing, mental health technology

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 32 full-time, 6 part-time[b], FTE 36
35[c]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 18/1

C. Number of counselors: 2

D. Student-counselor ratio: 336/1

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Student ratings, observation, individual conferences between director of faculty and teacher; teaching effectiveness measures are then discussed with other administrators.

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	60
Black	40

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of Institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$163,385	12	EOG	$88,093	170 total	25
		NDSL	20,000		
		College work-study	32,244		
		Vocational work-study	23,048		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - General Army Testing Battery 95
Differential Aptitude Test 40

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	25%
Lower ½	32
Upper ½	33
Upper ¼	10

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: Not available
1971 budget: $1,121,044[b]
$1,400,000[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 7,492	.7	$1668[b]
State	910,286	81.2	$2083[c]
Local	108,711	9.7	
Tuition	53,582	4.7	
Other	40,973	3.7	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: Department of Community Colleges under the board of education

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Primary authority for decision making on overall institutional policy - construction, income & expenditures, personnel policies, curriculum, admissions (in conjunction with local board)

C. Local supervisory agency: 12-member board of trustees; 4 appointed by governor, 4 appointed by board of education, 4 appointed by county board of commissioners

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Student policies and expenditures; personnel policies and curriculum (with state board)

E. Type of district: Single campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 9.1
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - 35/65
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 4%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	60
Black	40

C. Economy of community: $216,992,000 valuation

D. Size: 656 sq. miles
73,900 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 1
2. Other junior colleges - 0
3. Private technical institutes - 0

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $190,000 (1.7%)

C. Community service activities:

15 including speakers, community pride programs; training of firemen, policemen, rescue squad workers; education workshops

D. Courses offered off campus:

60; some classes are taught in the industrial plants where students are employed

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 50% academically disadvantaged

1. Programs - 7 developmental education programs; community advisory board for the educationally disadvantaged which develops and evaluates programs

2. Recruitment - On-campus tours, orientation programs; send recruiters and counselors directly into the community to locate the disadvantaged

3. Financial aid - EOG; work-study; Vocational Rehabilitation Act; $14,000 in special fund for the disadvantaged; Vocational Education Act for the Disadvantaged

F. Local advisory boards:

16 local advisory committees in curriculum areas to provide feedback on needs; advisory committees for occupational education and for the disadvantaged

G. Special community surveys:

Surveys on the socioeconomic characteristics of the community; on occupational and educational needs, and on the needs of the disadvantaged

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is no Director of Institutional Research

Liason not available

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

QUANTO

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 2190
Fall 1971 - 4082[b]; 4097[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 87[b]; 86[c]

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 1555
Part-time - 2527

2. Day - 1662
Evening - 2435

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 15

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 148[b]; 297[c]

2. Certificates - 0

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 149

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 14
Past 5 years - 15

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 11

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 2499

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Quanto - 29%

4. Other sources - In JCD 98%
Outside JCD 1
Foreign 1

II. Description of Establishment

1963 Established by state board of community colleges upon the request of the area community colleges

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	13	62	1215	29.7
Business	4	19	867	21.2
Transfer	4	19	2015	49.1
Non-credit			15	

B. Number of day courses: 123 total
Number of evening courses: 122 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Environmental technology, inhalation therapy, nursing, radiologic technology, early childhood assistance, dental hygiene, data processing, civil technology, electronics technology, fire science, law enforcement, occupational therapy

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 74 full-time, 8 part-time, FTE 77[b]
99[c]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 50/1[b]; 41/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 7

D. Student-counselor ratio: 583/1[b]; 585/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

No systematic evaluation; informal feedback from students

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent): Not available

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$159,370	11.7[b] 9.9[c]	EOG	$10,455	26	
		NDSL	7,667	24	
		Work-study	51,198	78	
		Nursing loan & scholarship	26,050	33	
		Cuban refugees	1,000		
		Strengthening developing institutions	11,000		
		Disadvantaged students program	52,000		

C. Students' ability

1. Mean academic ability scores - CEEB V=430
M=370

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	10%
Lower ½	50
Upper ½	20
Upper ¼	20

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $601,658

1971 budget: $1,611,036[b]
$1,356,652[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal[b]	$ 96,662	6	$332
State	1,240,498	77	
Tuition	273,876	17	
State[c]	$ 978,832	72	
Federal sponsored research	54,555	4	
Tuition	268,488	20	
Student aid	54,777	4	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: 18-member Board of Regional Community Colleges

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, personnel policies, non-professional personnel, curriculum, student policies

C. Local supervisory agency: Quanto Community College Advisory Board; appointed by governor

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Student policies (admissions, academic standards, activities, conduct)

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 11.2
2. Median annual income per family - $10,100
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - 45/55
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 12.8%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	95.3
Black	2.1
Spanish surname	1.9
Oriental	.7

C. Economy of community: $1,020,809,000 valuation (JCD)

D. Size: 1512 sq. miles (county)
637,969 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 6
2. Other junior colleges - 3
3. Private technical institutes - 0

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: (3.8%)

$200,000 for adult education (self-supporting activity)
$52,000 for community services (separate state allotment)

C. Community service activities:

Center for continuing education and community services; internship program of preparation for college (ESL; community problems; introduction to sociology; cultural, industrial, political aspects of community), cultural and social facilities open to community (lectures, films, theater, etc.)

D. Courses offered off campus:

Art museum studio courses; general studies at regional high schools

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 32% academically disadvantaged

1. Programs - Liason not available
2. Recruitment - Through community service programs
3. Financial aid - EOG, work-study, state disadvantaged student program

F. Local advisory boards:

12 advisory boards for occupational education; advisory board for the disadvantaged; specific program advisory boards

G. Special community surveys:

Community surveys for occupational needs, educational needs, needs of the disadvantaged; survey of black community and housing problems; survey of district to set up a branch campus

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is no Director of Institutional Research

Cost-analyses of programs and students; research on transferees and their progress (follow-up)

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

SHAW

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 11,637[b]; 22,316[c]
Fall 1971 - 15,582[b]; 19,819[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 34%[b]; 11% decrease[c]

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 9337
   Part-time - 6245
2. Day - 10,470
   Evening - 9,349
3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 2049

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 0
2. Certificates - 47
3. Transfers to 4-year college - 881[b]; 608[d]

E. Grading policy: No F grading

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 38
Past 5 years - Not available

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 48
2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 12,568
3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Shaw - 22.4%
4. Other sources -

In JCD	76.0%
Outside JCD	23.0
Outside state	.9
foreign	.1

II. Description of Establishment

1925 Established by state university
1946 Control transferred to separate junior college district
1951 Moved to present campus

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment		Percent of students
Vocational	24	52.0	169[b]	1880[c]	16
Business	2	4.3	52	650	5
Transfer	20	43.5	1205	9231	79
Non-credit	14		65	7000	

B. Number of day courses:

Vocational	72
Business	31
Transfer	204

Number of evening courses:

Vocational	62
Business	15
Transfer	126

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

25; no further information given

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 351 full-time, 231 part-time, FTE 400[b]
460[c]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 43/1[b]; 39/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 18

D. Student-counselor ratio: 593/1[b]; 865/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Not systematic; voluntary option of teacher

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	48[e]
Black	11[e]; 13[c]
Spanish surname	40[e]; 56[c]
Other not coded	31[c]

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$137,968[a]					9.4[b]
$693,400[c]	7	Work-study	$420,000	1465 total	7.4[c]
		Loans	192,000		
		Grants, scholarships	81,400		

C. Students' ability

1. Mean academic ability scores - ACT 16.5
CEEB 935.1

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	4%
Lower ½	46
Upper ½	42
Upper ¼	8

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $4.8 million
1971 budget: $9,591,291

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 197,056	2.1	$615[b]
State	5,382,000	56.1	$475[c]
Local	1,322,522	13.7	
Tuition	1,868,787	19.5	
Other	820,926	8.5	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Agency for Vocational-Technical Education; State Coordinating Board for Higher Education

B. Role of state in policy decisions:
Only as stipulated by legislation affecting 2-year colleges

C. Local supervisory agency: 7-member board of trustees elected for 6-year terms (staggered)

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:
Construction, financing, personnel policies, curriculum, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 11.6
2. Median annual income per family - $6,346
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 7%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	55.7
Black	6.6
Spanish surname	37.4
Oriental	.15
American Indian	.15

C. Economy of community: $445,000,000 valuation

D. Size: 1266 sq. miles
119,389 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 1
2. Other junior colleges - Not available
3. Private technical institutes - Not available

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is no Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $77,607 (.8%)

C. Community service activities: Not available

D. Courses offered off campus: No answer

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students:

1. Programs - Guided Studies program (remedial); compensatory basic studies for those with low ACT scores
2. Recruitment - No answer
3. Financial aid - EOG; work-study; State Opportunity Plan; all federal student financial aid programs

F. Local advisory boards:

There is an advisory board for all career and technically oriented programs; there is an advisory board for the needs of the disadvantaged

G. Special community surveys: None currently

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

No Director of Institutional Research

Institutional research not systematic or formalized--a proposal for a research section was turned down. The Guided Studies program was evaluated. A comparative study of the Reading and Skills Center was done with its first year of operation. A self-study was completed in 1964 and the next is projected for 1974.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

SHERWOOD

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 1898
Fall 1971 - 4054[b]; 6135[c]

B. Percent of increase from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 114[b]; 223[c]

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 3171[b]; 4825[c]
Part-time - 883[b]; 1551[c]

2. Day - 3137
Evening - 2473

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 1303

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 222[b]; 323[c]

2. Certificates - 83[b]; 30[c]

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 355[a]; unknown[c]

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 2
Past 5 years - 2

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 6

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 1533

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Sherwood - 44%[c]
22%[d]

4. Other sources -

In JCD	56%
Outside JCD	35
Outside state	3
Foreign	6

II. Description of Establishment

1965 Established by state legislature.
1966 Classes started.

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	13	27.5	432	10.7
Business	4	8.5	378	9.0
Transfer	30	64.0	3244	80.0
Non-credit	75		2081	

B. Number of day courses: 159 total
Number of evening courses: 99 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Mid-management, biological parks program, counselor aide program, audio-tutorial program, instruction in health-related programs, dental assistance, fire science, cardiovascular technology, recreation leadership, physician assistance (newest)

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 154 full-time, 17 part-time, 159.7 FTE[b]; 220[c]

B. Student-faculty ratio: 25/1[b]; 28/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 11

D. Student-counselor ratio: 368/1[b]; 557/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Three times a year; initiated in 1970-71 as a result of a pilot study on faculty evaluation. Evaluation instrument managed by the college's student government association. Results in the form of a rating scale for each class section are sent to instructors.

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	59.1
Black	9.8
Other not coded	31.1

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$357,952	8.6[b] 7.0[c]	EOG	$ 43,990	Not available	
		Work-study	74,275		
		NDL	117,359		
		LEEP	53,639		
		Nursing scholarship	16,818		
		Nursing loan	21,871		
		Cuban loan fund	30,000		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - No testing required
2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	4%
Lower ½	46
Upper ½	42
Upper ¼	8

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $2,386,167

1971 budget: $3,803,093[b]
$4,900,000[c]

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 295,304	7.7	$815
State	2,590,956	68.0	
Local	118,661	3.1	
Tuition	755,878	19.9	
Other	42,294	.1	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Junior College Council (division of community junior colleges under the state department of education); state legislature

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Responsible for all post-secondary education; income and construction (with local board); personnel (tenure, qualifications); establishes standards and criteria for work taught, approves establishment of public junior college regulations; appoints president; authorizes changes in tuition and fees; approves junior college budget; issues certificates

C. Local supervisory agency: 9-member junior college board of trustees, appointed by governor with recommendations by county board of public instruction

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Income and construction (with state board); expenditures, personnel policies, curriculum, student policies; adopts policies on recommendation of college relating to operation and improvements; sets minimum standards of junior college operation with state board

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - Not available
2. Median annual income per family - Not available
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - Not available
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 31

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	78.5
Black	20.9
Other not coded	.6

C. Economy of community: $670,660,000 valuation

D. Size: 1247 sq. miles (county)
830,460 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:
   1. 4-year schools - 6
   2. Other junior colleges - 0
   3. Private technical institutes - 8

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Dean of Community Education Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: $301,000 (7.9%)

C. Community service activities:

Sherwood Vocational Exploration Project (job exploration project concurrent with vocational counseling); learning labs; cultural development activities; 2 day care centers; teacher aides on-the-job training in public schools; demonstration of factory manufacture and/or assembly of usable parts; vocational rehabilitation - skill evaluation and instructions programs for disadvantaged male adults (e.g., job entry skills in electronics assembly); institutional management skills for disadvantaged females; summer workshops explore careers; continuing education to improve skills and cultural enrichment of the community

D. Courses offered off campus:

Vocational - cooking, keypunching, apprentice plumbing, pipe fitting, sewing, ceramics, aviation ground school, photography

Business - introduction to business, shorthand

General - economics, individual in the changing environment, state history, humanities, math

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 12% academically disadvantaged

   1. Programs - Transfer freshmen are required to take core basic general education; college parallel and adult education; Manpower Development and Training Act program; continuing education; vocational exploration project

   2. Recruitment - Student recruitment teams provide services to local high schools and to potential students in the community at large; assist in completing admissions forms; give information about programs and services; help solve problems related to orientation to college. Recruitment also by disadvantaged students themselves who gain work experience as recruiters, counselor aides, tutors, teacher aides, financial assistance counselors, etc.

   3. Financial aid - No answer

F. Local advisory boards:

12 for occupational education
12 for the needs of the disadvantaged

G. Special community surveys:

Surveys of the educational and occupational needs of the community; survey of the needs of the disadvantaged; semi-annual employment service surveys; survey by faculty of needs of blacks in the community; work with chamber of commerce on local survey of socioeconomic characteristics of the community

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is a Director of Institutional Research

Member of the League for Innovation in the Community College (with the junior college district); member of Community Junior College Inter-Institutional Research Council which coordinated research efforts.

Long-range planning; effectiveness of academic programs; effect of the college on the environment and community; project planning and financing; instructional objectives.

Dissertations: Post-junior college activities in the community of elected student government officers; examination of faculty development programs in the state's junior colleges.

Inter-institutional Research: Study related to identification, placement, and curriculum development for academically unprepared students in the state's junior colleges; follow-up study of students who were freshmen in 1966; an "ERIC" set up to compile research studies in junior colleges in the past 5 years; project to ascertain the degree of student rights, freedoms, and involvement in the junior college; composition writing study as a result of an English composition workshop held by the League for Innovation in the Community College at UCLA in 1968; college preferency report in conjunction with a state-wide twelfth grade testing program with high school seniors; survey of post-secondary occupational education involving faculty and administrators of 11 area vocational schools and 27 junior colleges.

College Research Projects: Follow-up study of graduates from 1966-1968; evaluation of Educational Aide Program; early childhood center (pre-school programs for children designed and constructed by college students; research of student progress in reading; study of evening students' counseling needs; project to investigate the role of a psychiatric consultant and the college; follow-up study of licensed practical nursing graduates 1959-1969; characteristics study of Fall 1970 students and comparison with their university counterparts; survey of characteristics and rewarding experiences of the area technical-vocational high school students (training of high school students in vocational programs); study of characteristics of evening students; difficulty analysis of the Common Program (general education) textbooks; graduate follow-up to compile graduate profile; development of evaluation instrument for faculty development.

College-endorsed programs: Conceptual cost-accounting model for a community junior college; selected student opinions about transfer problems; comparative analysis of the administrative structure and performance of community junior colleges in the state; comparison of self-concept, self-ideal, self-acceptance, and self-ideal congruence of university and junior college freshmen.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

WALDEN

I. Enrollment

A. Total: Fall 1967 - 8683
Fall 1971 - 8204[b]; 8165[c]

B. Percent of decrease from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971: 5.5[b]; 6[c]

C. Type of enrollment:

1. Full-time - 3556
Part-time - 4609

2. Day - Not available
Evening - Not available

3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - 80% incoming freshmen

D. Number of graduates in June 1971:

1. Associate degrees - 137[b]; 221[c]

2. Certificates - 200[b]; 74[c]

3. Transfers to 4-year college - 378[b]; 1000[c]

E. Grading policy: Standard A-F

F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - Not available
Past 5 years - 25

G. Source of students:

1. Number of local high schools - 50

2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - 15,000

3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Walden - 90%

II. Description of Establishment

1934 Established

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors		Percent of curricula		Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	11[c]	20[e]	25.6[c]	35[e]	1207[c]	14.8
Business	3	8	7.0	14		
Transfer		29	67.4	51	6958	85.0
Non-credit		67			2081	

B. Number of day courses: Vocational 23
Business 23
Transfer 179

Number of evening courses: Vocational 13
Business 32
Transfer 97

C. New majors added in the past 5 years:

Vocational - Electronics, X-ray technology, library technology, hotel-motel management, commercial art, horticulture, mechanical technology, vocational music

Business - Data processing

General - General studies program for disadvantaged, experimental English

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 266 full-time, 5 part-time, FTE 253

B. Student-faculty ratio: 30/1[b]; 31/1[c]

C. Number of counselors: 8

D. Student-counselor ratio: 1025/1[b]; 1020/1[c]

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Student evaluation of courses and instructors each term; committee of students and faculty for instructional evaluation; faculty questionnaire

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	90
Black	5
Spanish surname	4
Oriental	1

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds Type	Amount	Proportion of student body receiving aid Number	Percent
$200,174	3	Work-study	$29,063	368 total	4.5
		State loans	27,200		
		NDEA	516		
		Grants	63,091		
		College service aides	70,134		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - ACT 17.8

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	24.7%
Lower ½	31.6
Upper ½	26.3
Upper ¼	17.4

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: Not available
1971 budget: $6.5 million

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Federal	$ 65,000	1	$790
State	2,015,000	31	
Local	4,420,000	68	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: State Junior College Board

B. Role of state in policy decisions:

Regulatory; supplies money; reimbursement for courses based on enrollment; approves courses; investigates each community college based on Standards and Criteria for recognition; State Board of Education and Rehabilitation approves technical-occupational programs

C. Local supervisory agency: Junior college district board of trustees appointed by mayor for 3-year terms

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, personnel policies, curriculum, student policies

E. Type of district: Multi-campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - 10th grade
2. Median annual income per family - $9500-$10,000
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - 40/60
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - 12%

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	88
Black	3.4
Spanish surname	3.2
Oriental	2.0
American Indian	.2
Other not coded	1.5

C. Economy of community: $2 billion valuation

D. Size: 75 sq. miles
850,000 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 25
2. Other junior colleges - 2
3. Private technical institutes - 2

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is a Director of Community Services and Adult Education

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services:

No specific allocations--money from local sources as need arises

C. Community service activities:

Serves as consultant to local citizen groups working on community development projects and to improve the quality of service of those already so engaged.

Training of volunteer tutors as teacher aides in reading; continuing education; film series; art fairs; meetings with political candidates; music workshop; children's theater presentations.

Focus series - series of discussions on current events and subjects of social, economic, and educational interest; Forum series - series of speakers of foreign countries; rapport with elementary schools, high schools, and human relations groups.

D. Courses offered off campus:

13 including Allied Health, social service, social psychology, human growth and development, principles of accounting, mechanical technology, hotel-motel management, horticulture

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 24% academically disadvantaged

1. Programs - General studies
2. Recruitment - Walden is not located in low income part of the city; send counselors to inform the community and high schools of programs, financial aid, athletic programs; conduct tours of campus
3. Financial aid - EOP, work-study, college service aides

F. Local advisory boards:

14 for occupational education: one for each technical and occupational curriculum which governs all academic problems and situations pertaining to that curriculum; consist of at least 2 individuals presently employed in a local industry which employs graduates of the given program; the boards also assure that the demand for graduates of any particular program does in fact exist

G. Special community surveys:

Surveys for occupational needs, educational needs, and needs of the disadvantaged; survey of socioeconomic characteristics of the community (1969); faculty member in business department currently surveying the business curriculum needs based on the community business situation

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

There is an Office of Research and Evaluation

The Office of Research was established to provide basic data on community needs and student characteristics; assists the college in long-range planning (programs, budget, etc.); a faculty committee on evaluation is being developed; a newsletter disseminates information and opinion to faculty.

Follow-up study on experimental English 100; cost-accounting study of departments and programs; study of evening programs; study of transfer programs; evaluation of dean's honors program; follow-up of graduates; evaluation of general studies program; study of the effect of probation policy on students.

HEGIS; a clearinghouse of information prepares reports on grade distribution, attrition rates, item analysis of exams, etc.; work with ACT to develop a student guidance profile to be used by vocational-technical counselors; surveys of students by doctoral students: social cultural concomitants of achievement; demographic description of students; and psychological correlates of social conditions.

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research (cont'd)

Study on how well students from blue collar homes see the services of college related to goals and aspiration level; survey of black consciousness and militancy of students in classes

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

WARD

I. Enrollment

- A. Total: Fall 1967 - 2453
  Fall 1971 - 1725
- B. Percent of decrease from Fall 1967 to Fall 1971 - 30
- C. Type of enrollment:
  1. Full-time - 895
     Part-time - 830
  2. Day - 910
     Evening - 815
  3. In special programs (EOP, remedial) - Liason not available
- D. Number of graduates in June 1971:
  1. Associate degrees - 0
  2. Certificates - 10
  3. Transfers to 4-year college - 335
- E. Grading policy: Standard A-F
- F. Percent of withdrawals: Current - 51
  Past 5 years - 47
- G. Source of students:
  1. Number of local high schools - 60
  2. Number of high school graduates 1969-70 - Approximately 7,000
  3. Proportion of local high school graduates attending Ward - No answer

II. Description of Establishment

1905	Began as evening classes at local community center
1917	Became a division of major local university
1926	Ward Community Center Institute organized offering high school and technical courses
1938	Liberal arts added
1940	Ward Junior College Day Division established
1942	Ward Division of university merged with Ward Junior College

III. Program Emphasis and Enrollment

A.

Program	Number of majors	Percent of curricula	Enrollment	Percent of students
Vocational	None			
Transfer	Most		Liason not available	
Non-credit				

B. Number of day courses: 98 total
Number of evening courses: 135 total

C. New majors added in the past 5 years: None

IV. Professional Staff and Student-Staff Ratios

A. Number of instructors: 46 full-time 3 part-time 47.5 FTE

B. Student-faculty ratio: 36/1

C. Number of counselors: 1

D. Student-counselor ratio: 1725/1

E. Student evaluation of faculty:

Informal feedback

V. Students

A. Ethnic breakdown of student body (in percent):

Caucasian	91.0
Black	7.0
Spanish surname	.5
Oriental	1.0
Other not coded	.5

B. Financial aid:

Total aid	Percent of institution's budget	Source and funds		Proportion of student body receiving aid	
		Type	Amount	Number	Percent
$29,500	2.1	NDSL	$25,000	Not available	
		Work-study	4,500		

C. Students' ability:

1. Mean academic ability scores - CEEB M=450 V=400

2. Percentage of students at each high school GPA quartile -

Lower ¼	12
Lower ½	65
Upper ½	35
Upper ¼	5

VI. Finances

A. 1967 budget: $1,300,000
1971 budget: $1,390,647

B. Source and allocation:

Source	Allocation	Percent of budget	Expenditure per student (approximate)
Tuition	$1,326,824	95.4	$800
Endowments	19,514	1.4	
Gifts	6,100	.4	
Auxiliary	38,209	2.8	

VII. Governance

A. State supervisory agency: Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

B. Role of state in policy decisions: Accreditation

C. Local supervisory agency: 21-member Ward junior college district board of trustees; 11 are on the board of directors of a sponsoring agency, 8 are nominated by the trustees for 3 year terms

D. Role of local board in policy decisions:

Construction, finances, personnel policies, curriculum, student policies

E. Type of district: Single campus

VIII. Community Characteristics

A. Socioeconomic level:

1. Median educational level - High school graduate
2. Median annual income per family - $15,000
3. Proportion of white/blue collar workers - 60/40
4. Percent of population of college age (18-23) - Not available

B. Ethnic composition of community (in percent):

Caucasian	96
Black	2
Spanish surname	1
Other not coded	1

C. Economy of community: $1,020,809,000 valuation (JCD)

D. Size: 1,512 sq. miles (county)
637,969 population

E. Type and number of local colleges:

1. 4-year schools - 10
2. Other junior colleges - 2
3. Private technical institutes - 2

IX. Community Related Activities

A. There is no Director of Community Services

B. Proportion of budget allocated to community services: None

C. Community service activities:

None - Ward is a private school and is not community oriented; many students are not from the community.

In response to needs of the community and of the trustees, Ward formed a separate college offering 3rd and 4th year study in engineering technology leading to B.A. and B.S. degrees.

D. Courses offered off campus:

Consortium of Higher Education of 11 area colleges work in cooperative arrangement whereby students take specialized courses off campus (13 course areas) such as civil and industrial engineering, business administration, data processing.

E. Programs and aid for disadvantaged students: 5% academically disadvantaged

1. Programs - None special
2. Recruitment - None special
3. Financial aid - EOP

F. Local advisory boards:

The school sets up a program curriculum and then goes to the community to set up advisory board; advisory boards exist for occupational education and for the disadvantaged; activities through community agencies such as Community Action Council

G. Special community surveys: None on-going

X. Self-studies/Institutional Research

No Director of Institutional Research (research done via Registrar)

Very little. Correlation studies on academic performance; study of attrition rates; studies on how best to teach foreign students

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS
AND
TABLES TO CHAPTER 4

JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Introduction:

First of all, I would like to thank you for allowing us to include your college in our study. I know it puts an increased burden on you and your staff, and we appreciate your cooperation.

At each school in our survey, we're interviewing a sample of students, faculty and key administrators, using a questionnaire designed for very specific information.

In the case of the president of the college however, we're using a different technique. Basically we're asking you and the other presidents to talk more broadly about higher education in general and the junior colleges in particular.

There are two reasons for this approach. First, we think that you and the other presidents are in the best position to see an overall picture of the junior colleges today. Second, we think the president is the single most important person in determining the unique character of each college. Therefore, your view or philosophy of education, and of the role of the junior college, are important.

I'm using a tape recorder to facilitate this kind of interview. However, to maintain confidentiality, we plan to send you a complete transcript of this conversation for your approval before using it in any way. You may edit that transcript any way you wish, and you will not be quoted directly without your permission.

Since our time is limited, and we would like to get your views on many questions, please forgive me if I should cut in at times to move to another question.

If any of the questions seem ambiguous, please pin me down on them.

Are there any questions I could answer for you before we begin?

I. Philosophy

1. To start with, I would like to ask you about your thoughts on post-secondary education in general:

   A. What do you see as the most important goals for post-secondary education?

B. How should those goals be established?	Are they basically unchanging, or do they change with conditions? Do they come from the community or the institution?
C. Are these goals currently being met?	
D. If they are not currently being met, what changes would have to be made in education to realize these goals?	Would drastic changes be required?
E. Now, moving specifically to the junior college: What do you see as unique about junior colleges? Where do they fit in your concept of education?	
F. What do you think is the main purpose of the junior college; the main priority?	Transfer education, occupational education, general education, community services?
G. Which is most important? Why?	
H. How would you describe your own role in carrying out the unique functions of the junior college?	
I. Are you comfortable with that role?	Would you prefer a different one?

II. Your Institution

Perhaps this would be a good point to move away from these broader, general questions, and to ask you about this particular college:

A. We were talking a few moments ago about educational goals. How are you going about implementing those goals here?

For example, you mentioned ____________ What do you do to implement that here?

Frequent goals concern:
- teaching quality
- community service
- counseling
- disadvantaged students

B. Which goals do you think you've most successfully implemented here?

C. In what areas would you like to see further improvement?

D. In trying to implement your educational goals in this college, what are some of the administrative problems you face?

For example, do you ever have problems with the board of trustees? Or with the faculty?

Do you deal directly with the faculty, or through the administrative staff?

Can you deal directly with the faculty without undermining your staff?

Are there issues like salary which present problems?

E. Do you have much contact with the students? How do you maintain contact?

F.	What about relationships between the college and government agencies: Do these agencies help you to implement your goals?	For example, how do state agencies affect the college? How responsive is the state legislature to your college's needs?
G.	Are there shortcomings and problems involved in these relationships?	For example, does increased control over policies and goals come with increased assistance?
H.	What changes would you like to see in these relationships?	Realistic chance of such changes coming about?
I.	What about the community this college serves? How would you describe the relationship between your college and the community?	Does the community generally support the college? How? tax support alumni associations attendance at campus events industrial/commercial cooperation Are there any problems between the college and the community that you're aware of? Over what? What segments of the community are involved?

III. The Future

We've talked about your approach to education, your goals, and also about your day-to-day work in running a junior college. Now I would like to ask you some questions about your thoughts on the future:

A. Do you think you will be dealing with different kinds of problems if you're sitting in that seat five years from now?	For example, do you see changes occurring in society which might have an impact on junior colleges? Do you see the role of junior colleges changing? Why? How?
B. What kinds of things are you doing now in preparation for those future problems?	For example, do you think more research is needed on some of the changes happening in society?
C. Finally, a question about the U.S. Office of Education. How could that office be of help to you as a junior college president?	

IV. Conclusion

Those are all the questions I have.

Is there anything you would like to add?

I would like to thank you again for your help.

As I said before, I will send you a transcript of this interview as soon as I can have it typed.

Thank you very much.

DEAN OF INSTRUCTION

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS

I would like to ask you some questions about the role of your junior college relative to the needs of this community and to the needs of the students.

1. (A) WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE COMMUNITY YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE SERVES? (Probe for what part of the city mostly served and its demographic characteristics, i.e. socioeconomic, ethnic and age composition.)

1. (B) WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE BASIC REASONS MOST STUDENTS ATTEND YOUR COLLEGE?

2. (A) HAVE YOU MADE ANY ATTEMPTS TO DETERMINE THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY? (Probe for systematic surveys, studies, etc.)

   1. _____Yes (If yes, by what methods?)

   2. _____No (If no, why not? Probe for whether surveys are considered valuable.)

2. (B) IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE 2 or 3 MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THIS COMMUNITY? (Rank by order of importance)

2. (C) WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO MEET THESE NEEDS?

2. (D) HOW WELL IS THE INSTITUTION MEETING THESE NEEDS?

3. (A) DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL METHODS FOR DETERMINING THE MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF YOUR STUDENTS? (Probe for systematic surveys, studies, etc.)

   1. ______Yes (By what methods?)

   2. ______No (Why not? Probe for whether surveys are considered valuable.)

3. (C) WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO MEET THESE NEEDS?

3. (D) HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE INSTITUTION IS MEETING THE NEEDS OF ITS STUDENTS?

4. WHAT ARE THE 3 MAJOR PROBLEMS YOU ANTICIPATE AT THIS INSTITUTION OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS? (Can you rank them?)

5. WHAT FEDERAL AGENCIES AFFECT THIS INSTITUTION AND HOW DO THEY AFFECT THIS INSTITUTION?

6. (A) WHAT FEDERAL PROGRAMS DO YOU HAVE HERE?

6. (B) WHAT PERCENT OF THE BUDGET DO THEY COMPRISE?

6. (C) WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THESE PROGRAMS?

11. IF YOU WERE TO RECEIVE EXTRA FUNDING, FROM ANY SOURCE, WHICH INCREASED YOUR BUDGET 20%, HOW WOULD YOU ALLOCATE THOSE FUNDS? (Probe for specifics)

12. IF YOUR FUNDS WERE TO BE DECREASED BY 20%, IN WHICH AREAS WOULD YOU MAKE CUTBACKS? (Probe for specifics)

14. WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS FACING THIS INSTITUTION? (Probe for faculty administrative relations and other administrative personnel problems. Probe for increased participation in policy formulation by faculty and students, faculty-student advisory groups, etc.)

15. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS YOU HAVE EXPERIENCED WITH RESPECT TO THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF? (Probe for recruitment, job satisfaction and competence of faculty and other professional staff)

16. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION OF A JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR? (e.g. Teaching experience at elementary, secondary, junior college and four-year level: Academic record: Demonstrated interest in students, and scholarly work.)

17. WHAT EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES DO YOU USE FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS?

18. DOES THIS COLLEGE CONDUCT ANY INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH?

    1. _____Yes (What types and have you found this research to be helpful to you in performing your duties? Please explain)

    2. _____No (Would you like to see this institution conduct its own institutional research? Please explain. Probe for the nature and benefits or lack of value of such research.)

26. THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IS CONSIDERING MAKING PERIODIC SURVEYS OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION WOULD BE MOST USEFUL TO THIS INSTITUTION, IF THE SURVEY WERE TO BE COLLECTED ON A REGULAR BASIS BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

DEAN OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS

I would like to ask you some questions about the role of your junior college relative to the needs of this community and to the needs of the students.

1. (A) WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE COMMUNITY YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE SERVES? (Probe for what part of the city mostly served and its demographic characteristics, i.e. socioeconomic, ethnic and age composition.)

1. (B) WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE BASIC REASONS MOST STUDENTS ATTEND YOUR COLLEGE?

2. (A) HAVE YOU MADE ANY ATTEMPTS TO DETERMINE THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY? (Probe for systematic surveys, studies, etc.)

   1. ______Yes (If yes, by what methods?)
   2. ______No (If no, why not? Probe for whether surveys are considered valuable.)

2. (B) IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE 2 or 3 MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THIS COMMUNITY? (Rank by order of importance)

2. (C) WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO MEET THESE NEEDS?

2. (D) HOW WELL IS THE INSTITUTION MEETING THESE NEEDS?

3. (A) DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIAL METHODS FOR DETERMINING THE MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF YOUR STUDENTS?
(Probe for systematic surveys, studies, etc.)

1. _____Yes (By what methods?)

2. _____No (Why not? Probe for whether surveys are considered valuable.)

3. (B) IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE 2 or 3 MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS PRESENTLY ATTENDING THIS COLLEGE? (Rank by order of importance)

3. (C) WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO MEET THESE NEEDS?

3. (D) HOW WELL DO YOU THINK THE INSTITUTION IS MEETING THE NEEDS OF ITS STUDENTS?

4. WHAT ARE THE 3 MAJOR PROBLEMS YOU ANTICIPATE AT THIS INSTITUTION OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS? (Can you rank them?)

5. WHAT FEDERAL AGENCIES AFFECT THIS INSTITUTION AND HOW DO THEY AFFECT THIS INSTITUTION?

6. (A) WHAT FEDERAL PROGRAMS DO YOU HAVE HERE?

6. (B) WHAT PERCENT OF THE BUDGET DO THEY COMPRISE?

6. (C) WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THESE PROGRAMS?

11. IF YOU WERE TO RECEIVE EXTRA FUNDING, FROM ANY SOURCE, WHICH INCREASED YOUR BUDGET 20%, HOW WOULD YOU ALLOCATE THOSE FUNDS? (Probe for specifics)

12. IF YOUR FUNDS WERE TO BE DECREASED BY 20%, IN WHICH AREAS WOULD YOU MAKE CUTBACKS? (Probe for specifics)

13. WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT RESPONSIBILITIES OF YOUR FACULTY? (Probe for the three most important and rank them)

15. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS YOU HAVE EXPERIENCED WITH RESPECT TO THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF? (Probe for recruitment, job satisfaction and competence of faculty and other professional staff)

16. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT QUALIFICATION OF A JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR? (e.g. Teaching experience at elementary, secondary, junior college and four-year level: Academic record: Demonstrated interest in students, and scholarly work.)

17. WHAT EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES DO YOU USE FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS?

18. DOES THIS COLLEGE CONDUCT ANY INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH?

    1. ______Yes (What types and have you found this research to be helpful to you in performing your duties? Please explain)

    2. ______No (Would you like to see this institution conduct its own institutional research? Please explain. Probe for the nature and benefits or lack of value of such research.)

20. WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE IN THE COMMUNITY?

21. PLEASE DESCRIBE THOSE PROGRAMS NOW OPERATING IN YOUR AREA OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WHICH DIRECTLY RELATE TO THE OPPORTUNITIES IN THE COMMUNITY. (Probe for on-the-job training, local business and industry cooperation.)

26. THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IS CONSIDERING MAKING PERIODIC SURVEYS OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION WOULD BE MOST USEFUL TO THIS INSTITUTION, IF THE SURVEY WERE TO BE COLLECTED ON A REGULAR BASIS BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

DEAN OF PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS

I would like to ask you some questions about the role of your junior college relative to the needs of this community and to the needs of the students.

1. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE MAJOR COUNSELING NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS AT THIS COLLEGE?	Low ability? Need for remediation? Unrealistic aspirations? Lack of vocational information? Uncertainty about future plans? Need for cultural enrichment? Special or unique counseling needs of students at this college?
2. WHAT PROPORTION OF THE STUDENT BODY AVAILS THEMSELVES OF THE SERVICES OF THE STUDENT COUNSELING SERVICE?	Are there any sectors of the student population that use student counseling services more than others?
3. WHAT IS THE STUDENT/COUNSELOR RATIO AT THE COLLEGE?	
4. WHAT KINDS OF PROGRAMS EXIST TO MEET THE COUNSELING NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS?	Learning center? Peer counseling?
5. HAVE YOU ANY MEANS OF EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR COUNSELING PROGRAM?	What are some of the results?
6. WHAT ARE THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE POSITION OF COUNSELOR AT THE COLLEGE?	

7. WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN THE COUNSELING PROGRAM?	Course advising? Vocational guidance? Personal counseling? How would you assess the faculty response?
8. IS THERE AN OPERATIVE PHILOSOPHY OF COUNSELING AMONG THE STAFF AT THIS COLLEGE?	Basic aims of the counseling program?
9. WHAT, IF ANY, FORMAL PROVISIONS ARE THERE FOR INPUT INTO POLICY MAKING FROM THE COUNSELING SERVICE IN ANY AREA OF INSTITUTIONAL OPERATION?	Student affairs? Curriculum? Finance?

10. HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK ON THE AVERAGE DO YOU SPEND IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?

    Counseling

    Teaching

    Research

    Administration

    Other (specify)

11. NOW SPECIFICALLY WITH REGARD TO THE TIME DEVOTED TO COUNSELING, WHAT PROPORTION DO YOU ALLOCATE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING?

    Advisement on course selection

    Long-range educational guidance

    Vocational counseling

    Personal counseling

    Other (specify)

12. (If time permits)
WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE MAJOR TRENDS IN STUDENT COUNSELING? ARE THERE DISCERNIBLE SHIFTS IN COUNSELING NEEDS OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS? WHAT CHANGES DO YOU FORESEE IN THE YEARS AHEAD?

FISCAL OFFICER

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR KEY ADMINISTRATORS

I would like to ask you some questions about the role of your junior college relative to the needs of this community and to the needs of the students.

6. (A) WHAT FEDERAL PROGRAMS DO YOU HAVE HERE?

6. (B) WHAT PERCENT OF THE BUDGET DO THEY COMPRISE?

6. (C) WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THESE PROGRAMS?

9. WHAT DO YOU PERCEIVE TO BE YOUR COLLEGE'S MOST IMPORTANT FINANCIAL NEEDS AT THE PRESENT TIME? (Probe for difficulties and for priority?)

10. WHAT ARE YOUR PRESENT PRIMARY SOURCES OF REVENUE? (Probe for relative percentages)

11. IF YOU WERE TO RECEIVE EXTRA FUNDING, FROM ANY SOURCE, WHICH INCREASED YOUR BUDGET 20%, HOW WOULD YOU ALLOCATE THOSE FUNDS? (Probe for specifics)

12. IF YOUR FUNDS WERE TO BE DECREASED BY 20%, IN WHICH AREAS WOULD YOU MAKE CUTBACKS? (Probe for specifics)

22. DO YOU RUN COST-ANALYSIS STUDIES AT THIS COLLEGE?

    1. _____No

    2. _____Yes (Please specify. Does the state require such information from you? Can you give us the cost for each student per course or program?)

23. IS THE DATA BASE UPON WHICH YOU MAKE FISCAL RECOMMENDATIONS ADEQUATE? (e.g. student enrollment figures, enrollment trend analysis, and other kinds of "costing out" data)

1. _____Yes (What kinds of data do you use?)

2. _____No (What kinds of data would you like to have?)

24. WOULD YOU INDICATE SOME IMPORTANT FISCAL STUDIES WHICH YOU THINK OUGHT TO BE CONDUCTED BY YOUR INSTITUTION, THE STATE, AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

YOUR INSTITUTION:

THE STATE:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:

25. WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THAT PORTION OF YOUR BUDGET WHICH IS "RESTRICTED" BY STATE LAW AND HOW THIS LEGALITY AIDS OR IMPEDES YOUR EFFORTS?

26. THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IS CONSIDERING MAKING PERIODIC SURVEYS OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. WHAT KIND OF INFORMATION WOULD BE MOST USEFUL TO THIS INSTITUTION, IF THE SURVEY WERE TO BE COLLECTED ON A REGULAR BASIS BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION?

TABLE 4-1

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS STRESSED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Type of educational goal stressed	(Number)*	Percent
I. Personal development of student	(8)	57
II. Social development of student	(10)	71
III. Societal development	(9)	64
IV. Other	(1)	7

*Number of respondents = 14. Many presidents gave responses in more than one category.

TABLE 4-2

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT-ORIENTED EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Goals	Presidents by number														
	1	2	3*	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Cognitive-intellectual development								x	x		x				x
Emotional development				x			x		x			x	x		x
Cultural-aesthetic development								x							
Philosophical development									x				x		x
Development of social skills				x			x	x	x		x				
Development of political skills	x										x				
Development of economic skills				x	x	x	x	x	x	x					x
Total	1	0	*	3	1	1	3	4	5	1	3	1	2	0	4

*President No. 3 of the sample was unavailable for interview. Total number of respondents = 14.

TABLE 4-3

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF SYSTEM FUNCTION STRESSED IN ROLE DEFINITION BY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS*

Type of system function	(Number)	Percent
I. System maintenance	(10)	71
II. System integration	(4)	28
III. System adaptation	(8)	57
IV. Goal attainment	(4)	28

*Many presidents gave responses in more than one category. Multiple responses in the same category were counted as one.

TABLE 4-4

DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCES OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS STRESSED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Sources	(Number)	Percent
I. Sources internal to the college	(9)	64
A. The college in general	(4)	29
B. The president, administrators	(4)	29
C. Faculty	(4)	29
D. Students	(6)	43
II. Community or public sources	(13)	93
A. The public in general	(10)	71
B. Local employers	(2)	14
C. Public agencies (national and state)	(4)	29
D. Board of trustees	(2)	14
III. Other	(2)	14

*Most presidents gave multiple answers which fell into various sub-classes of both major categories of responses. Therefore the percentage totals of the sub-classes may exceed the percentage of the category as a whole.

TABLE 4-5

FREQUENCY OF ADMINISTRATORS' REFERENCE TO FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION PROBLEMS*

Type of problem	Presidents (N = 14)**		Deans of instruction (N = 15)		Deans of vocational education (N = 15)	
	(Number)	Percent	(Number)	Percent	(Number)	Percent
1. Differences regarding philosophy, priorities	(4)	29	--	--	--	--
2. Attempts to assert excessive control over decision-making by faculty	(1)	7	(2)	13	(1)	7
3. Resistance to changes and innovation by faculty	(1)	7	(4)	27	(4)	27
4. Lack of proper orientation toward the junior college	--	--	(1)	7	(3)	20
5. Lack of rapport between faculty and administration			(2)	13	--	--
6. Insufficient participation in, and responsibility for, decision-making by faculty	(2)	14	(3)	20	--	--
7. Other	(2)	14	--	--	--	--
8. None mentioned	(6)		(7)		(8)	

*Some respondents gave multiple responses; therefore, the total number of responses does not correspond to the number of responding administrators.

**Due to scheduling difficulties, one president was unavailable for interview. In total, 14 presidents were interviewed.

TABLE 4-6

FREQUENCY OF ADMINISTRATORS' REFERENCE TO MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS*

Administrative problem	President N = 14 (Number)	President N = 14 Percent	Dean of instruction N = 15 (Number)	Dean of instruction N = 15 Percent	Fiscal officer** N = 15 (Number)	Fiscal officer** N = 15 Percent
1. Recruitment	(3)	21	(2)	13	--	--
2. Budget	(5)	36	(3)	20	--	--
a) Capital outlay					(9)	60
b) Salaries	(3)	21	(1)	7	(6)	40
c) Equipment	(1)	7	(1)	7	(6)	40
d) Other					(8)	53
3. Internal communication	(1)	7	(5)	33	--	--
4. Decision-making and organizational procedures.	(2)	14	(6)	40	--	--
5. Other	(2)	14	(11)	73	--	--
6. None mentioned	(7)		(2)		(1)	

*Some officials gave multiple answers. Therefore the total number of responses does not necessarily correspond to the number of administrations responding.

**Fiscal officers were limited to identifying budgetary problems.

TABLE 4-7

ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC AREAS OF COLLEGE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS AS REPORTED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Area of college-community relationship	Cited as good (Number)	Cited as good Percent	Cited as inadequate (Number)	Cited as inadequate Percent
1. Tax support	(3)	21	(2)	14
2. Cooperation with business community	(3)	21	--	--
3. Attendance at public events	(4)	29	(2)	14
4. Response to community service programs	(2)	14	--	--
5. Approval of adult education programs	(2)	14	--	--
6. Alumni support	(2)	14	(2)	14
7. Support from other specified sectors	--	--	(3)	21
8. Other	--	--	(6)	43
Total responding*	(7)	50	(9)	64

*A total of 14 presidents were interviewed. Most of these officers gave multiple responses. Therefore, the sum of total responses exceeds the number of presidents responding.

TABLE 4-8

MAJOR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY AS REPORTED BY DEANS OF INSTRUCTION AND DEANS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Educational need	Deans of instruction		Deans of vocational education	
	(Number)	Percent	(Number)	Percent
1. General education	(1)	7	(2)	13
2. Adult (continuing) education	(3)	20	(2)	13
3. Remedial education	(6)	40	(4)	27
4. Transfer (academic education	(1)	7	(1)	7
5. Vocational counseling and training	(9)	60	(6)	40
6. Educational programs for minority and disadvantaged sectors of the community	--	--	(4)	27
7. Modification of community attitudes toward education in general, and vocational education in particular	(7)	47	(5)	33
8. Educational support services (health, financial, etc.)	(3)	20	--	--
9. Other	(2)	13	(1)	7
Total responding*	(14)	93	(11)	73

*Most respondents gave multiple responses. Therefore the sum of responses in all categories exceeds the total of respondents.

TABLE 4-9

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS AS REPORTED BY DEANS OF INSTRUCTION, DEANS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND CHIEF FISCAL OFFICERS

Responses	Deans of instruction		Deans of voc. educ.		Fiscal officers	
	(Number)	Percent	(Number)	Percent	(Number)	Percent
WEAKNESSES						
1. Funds too sporadic and/or insufficient	(5)	33	(3)	20	(7)	47
2. Excessive administrative requirements	(3)	20	(3)	20	(7)	47
3. Inflexible administrative requirements	(5)	33	(3)	20	(5)	33
4. Matching requirements hurt small schools	(1)	7	(1)	7	(2)	13
5. Other	-	-	-	-	(2)	13
Total responding*	(10)	67	(6)	40	(11)	73
STRENGTHS						
1. Financial aid to students	-	-	(1)	7	(7)	47
2. Stimulation of educational programs	(3)	20	(2)	13	(5)	33
3. Stimulation of development of physical plant	J	-	-	-	(3)	20
4. Other	(2)	13	(3)	20	(2)	13
Total responding*	(5)	33	(4)	27	(10)	67

*Most respondents gave multiple responses. Therefore the sum total of responses exceeds the total of respondents.

APPENDIX C

STUDENT MARGINAL DATA
AND
TABLES TO CHAPTER 5

164/165

O.M.B. No. 51-S71038E
APPROVAL EXPIRES 6-30-72

THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

MARGINALS

and

% Missing Observations (in Parentheses)

Center for the Study of Evaluation
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Office of Education Contract No. 0-70-4795
OE FORM 2337-3, 11/71

Dear Student:

You have been randomly chosen to participate in a nationwide study of a select group of community colleges. This study is being undertaken by the Higher Education Project of U.C.L.A.'s Center for the Study of Evaluation under contract to the National Center for Educational Statistics of the Office of Education. The study is designed to provide suggestions to the Office of Education for more effective development of community or two-year colleges in their effort to serve students.

By taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire you will be making a significant contribution toward bridging the gap between action at the federal level and real needs at colleges such as yours.

Be assured that responses to this questionnaire will be analyzed in a statistical sense only and that your anonymity will be absolutely protected by your following the directions listed below.

1. Do not write your name on this booklet.
2. When you have completed this questionnaire, please write your name and school in the space provided on the attached postcard (on the left).
3. Detach the postcard and return it in a mailing separate from the questionnaire.

This procedure allows us to know who has not returned the questionnaire while preserving the strict anonymity of the questionnaire respondents themselves. We will then be able to send follow-up requests to the nonrespondents. At no time will your responses be seen by anyone from your institution.

We will be very grateful if you would complete and return this questionnaire to us within 5 days. We thank you in advance for the time taken from your schedule to complete this questionnaire.

Very sincerely,

James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

Postage
Will Be Paid
by
Addressee

No
Postage Stamp
Necessary
If Mailed in the
United States

BUSINESS REPLY CARD

First Class Permit No. 16046, Los Angeles, California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
MOORE HALL 145
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

When you have completed and returned this questionnaire, please return this postcard in a separate mailing. Please also write your name and school in the space below.

By so doing, you allow us to know who has returned questionnaires while preserving the strict anonymity of the questionnaires themselves.

Name ____________________________________

School ____________________________________

Thank you

This questionnaire contains items about your general, educational and occupational background and your needs, attitudes, interests and activities. We hope that you will be able to respond to all of the items, but feel free to skip any item you prefer not to answer.

YOUR GENERAL BACKGROUND

1. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE WHERE YOU ARE ENROLLED?

____

2. WHAT WAS YOUR AGE AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 19[illegible]? 16-19=39% 24-29=19%
20-23=23% 30-38=12%
39-66=7%

3. WHAT IS YOUR SEX? 1. 58 Male 2. 42 Female (1)*

4. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUP?

1. 1 American Indian
2. 77 Caucasian White
3. 16 Negro Black
4. 1 Oriental
5. 5 Spanish surname: a. ___ Mexican American/Chicano
(3) b. 1 Puerto Rican
c. ___ Other (Please specify: ________)

6. ___ Other (Please specify: ________)

5. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE COMMUNITY YOU CONSIDER TO BE YOUR HOME (a) WHILE YOU WERE IN HIGH SCHOOL, AND (b) AT PRESENT? (Please check each column.)

	(a) While in High School	(b) At Present
1. LARGE CITY (over 500,000)		
a. Within the city	25	26
b. In a suburb of the city	9	10
2. CITY (50,000 to 500,000)		
a. Within the city	16	21
b. In a suburb of the city	6	8
3. SMALL CITY OR TOWN (less than 50,000)	34	30
4. FARM OR OPEN COUNTRY	10	5
	(5)	(7)

*Parentheses indicate missing data.

6. WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF YOUR FAMILY'S INCOME WHEN YOU WERE 17 YEARS OLD?

1. 12 Less than $3,000
2. 23 $ 3,001 to $6,000
3. 32 $ 6,001 to $10,000
4. 22 $10,001 to $15,000
5. 9 $15,001 to $25,000
6. 3 Over $25,000

(5)

7. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST FORMAL EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ATTAINED BY BOTH YOUR MOTHER AND FATHER? (Please check each column once.)

	Father	Mother
1. 8th grade or less	26	20
2. Some high school	17	19
3. High school graduate	25	34
4. Vocational, technical or business schools beyond grade 12	8	9
5. Some college	13	11
6. Bachelor's degree	5	4
7. Some graduate work	2	1
8. Master's degree	2	1
9. Doctorate or professional degree	3	1
10. Does not apply		
11. Do not know		
	(5)	(4)

8. PLEASE INDICATE THE OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF BOTH YOUR FATHER AND MOTHER WHEN YOU WERE 17 YEARS OLD. (If either of your parents were deceased when you were 17, mark their last occupation.)

PLEASE ALSO INDICATE WHAT YOU EXPECT YOUR OCCUPATION WILL BE.

	Father	**Mother**	**Your-self**
1. General worker (such as custodian, farm laborer, general and domestic laborer)	12	7	5
2. Semi-skilled worker (such as machine operator, retail clerk, waitress, truck driver, mail carrier, barber)	22	14	7
3. Skilled clerical or sales (such as bookkeeper, sales representative, secretary)	6	13	10
4. Skilled craftsman or foreman (such as electrician, baker, carpenter, bricklayer, factory foreman)	23	1	6
5. Protective service worker (such as policeman, military, fireman)	4	0	4
6. Owner or manager of small business or firm (such as insurance or real estate agent, store proprietor, contractor)	11	2	5
7. Farm owner or manager	5	0	1
8. Semi-professional or technician (such as programmer, lab technician)	2	2	13
9. Managerial and professional I (such as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, school teacher, engineer, certified public accountant)	13	5	33
10. Managerial and Professional II such as [illegible] lawyer)	3	2	9
11. Housewife	1	53	1
12. Unemployed		1	7
13. Don't know			
	(5)	(3)	(16)

9. HOW MANY BOOKS WERE IN YOUR HOME WHEN YOU WERE 17 YEARS OLD?

1. 23 25 or less
2. 17 26 - 50
3. 20 51 - 100
4. 22 101 - 250
5. 18 251 or more

(1)

10. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW YOUR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT PLANS, IF ANY.

1. 67 I am presently employed
2. 10 I am not working, and do not plan to work while in college
3. 14 I am not working, but am looking for a part-time job
4. 4 I am not working, but am looking for a full-time job
5. 5 I have not made any plans yet

(1)

11. IF YOU ARE NOW WORKING, PLEASE INDICATE HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK YOU ARE EMPLOYED.

1. 4 9 hours per week or less
2. 21 10 to 19 hours per week
3. 17 20 to 29 hours per week
4. 11 30 to 39 hours per week
5. 47 40 or more hours per week
6. Does not apply

(35)

YOUR EDUCATIONAL STATUS

12. WHAT IS YOUR HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE? (Please place a check in the column next to the letter which represents your high school grade point average and also your college grade point average if you have completed at least one full semester or quarter.)

	High School grade point average	**College grade point average (before current term)**
1. A	5	12
2. B	34	41
3. C+	30	26
4. C	21	16
5. C-	7	5
6. D or below	2	2
7. Does not apply		
	(3)	(11)

13. ARE YOU A FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME STUDENT? (Full-time represents at least 12 semester units or 12 quarter units.)

1. 63 Full-time student
2. 37 Part-time student
(2)

14. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ENROLLMENT CLASSIFICATION? (Please check as many as apply.)

1. 90 Enrolled in regular credit classes (2)
2. 6 Enrolled in adult education classes (2)
3. 3 Enrolled in noncredit classes (2)
4. 6 Other (Please specify: (2)
5. Do not know

15. WHEN ARE YOUR CLASSES SCHEDULED?

1. 56 Days only
2. 30 Nights only (after 4:00 p.m.)
3. 14 Both day and night
(2)

16. HOW MANY COLLEGE UNITS HAVE YOU COMPLETED? (Please check either semester or quarter units, whichever applicable.)

	Semester units	Quarter units
1. 15 or under	36	43
2. 16 – 30	21	16
3. 31 – 45	16	11
4. 46 – 60	15	13
5. 61 – 100	9	13
6. Over 100	4	5
	(29)	(80)

17. A. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT MAJOR? (Below is a list of majors grouped by subject areas. Please check the *one* that best describes your current major in either the "Transfer" list or the Two-Year program list. Note: "Transfer" Majors that normally require a bachelor's or higher degree are listed in the first section. Majors normally requiring two years or less are listed next.)

"TRANSFER" MAJORS

LETTERS AND SCIENCES

1. ______General liberal arts

SOCIAL SCIENCES

2. ______Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology
3. ______History, Political Science, Economics
4. ______Afro-American (black culture) studies
5. ______Mexican-American studies
6. ______Other Social Sciences

SCIENCES (NON-MEDICAL) AND MATHEMATICS

7. ______Biological Sciences
8. ______Mathematics
9. ______Physics
10. ______Chemistry
11. ______Earth Sciences
12. ______Other Physical Sciences

17. A. "TRANSFER" MAJORS (Continued)

FINE ARTS

13. ______Art
14. ______Music
15. ______Drama
16. ______Other fine arts

HUMANITIES AND LANGUAGES

17. ______Foreign languages
18. ______English
19. ______Speech
20. ______Philosophy
21. ______Other humanities

MEDICAL PROFESSIONS

22. ______Nursing (4 years)
23. ______Dentistry
24. ______Medicine (M.D.)
25. ______Optometry, Pharmacy, Pre-vet.
26. ______Other medical (4 years)

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

27. ______Agriculture
28. ______Animal sciences
29. ______Forestry and other natural resources
(fish and game management, etc.)

EDUCATION

30. ______Elementary
31. ______Physical education
32. ______Business education
33. ______Vocational education
34. ______Other (e.g., special education)

17. A. "TRANSFER" MAJORS (Continued)

OTHER PROFESSIONAL AREAS

35. ______ Architecture, urban planning, etc.
36. ______ Business administration, accounting, etc.
37. ______ Computer sciences
38. ______ Engineering
39. ______ Home economics, nutrition, etc.
40. ______ Law
41. ______ Law enforcement, corrections, criminology
42. ______ Other (Journalism, Library Science, Religion, etc.)

UNDECIDED IN ANY AREA

43. ______ Undecided

TWO-YEAR PROGRAMS

AGRICULTURE

44. ______ Agriculture, animal science, forestry and natural resources

BUSINESS

45. ______ Management, accounting
46. ______ Marketing, sales
47. ______ Secretarial
48. ______ Data processing
49. ______ Other business

ARTS

50. ______ Art, photography, clothing design, journalism

HEALTH SERVICES

51. ______ Registered nursing
52. ______ Vocational nursing
53. ______ Medical-dental assisting
54. ______ Medical technicians (Lab Tech., X-ray, etc.)
55. ______ Other medical

PUBLIC PERSONAL SERVICES

56. ______Police science
57. ______Fire science
58. ______Cosmetology
59. ______Teacher aide, nursery school education, social welfare aide
60. ______Home economics
61. ______Airline stewardess
62. ______Other

TECHNICAL

63. ______Aeronautics, aviation
64. ______Automotive repair
65. ______Building trades (including refrigeration, heating, plumbing, air conditioning)
66. ______Drafting tool design
67. ______Engineering Aide: civil, mechanical, surveying, chemical
68. ______Electronics and appliance repair
69. ______Industrial management
70. ______Food services, restaurant management
71. ______Mechanical (machine shop, welding)
72. ______Printing — lithographics
73. ______Metals — metallurgy, plastics, sheet metal
74. ______Textiles — upholstering, sewing, garment manufacturing
75. ______Other (Please specify: ______________________________)

UNDECIDED IN ANY AREA

76. ______Undecided

17. B. IF YOU HAVE CHANGED YOUR MAJOR ONE OR MORE TIMES, WHAT WAS YOUR FIRST MAJOR? (Please write the major and its number selected from the above list.)

First major: ____ ______________________________________

18. WHAT ARE YOUR EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES AT THIS INSTITUTION? (Please check as many as apply.)

1. 42 Earn an AA degree and transfer to a four-year school (2)
2. 11 Complete two years and transfer without an AA degree (2)
3. 8 Transfer before completing two years (2)
4. 16 Earn an AA degree only (2)
5. 6 Earn a vocational certificate only (2)
6. 14 Take a group of courses to prepare for an occupation (2)
7. 8 Take a few courses to improve my skills in my present occupation (2)
8. 11 Take a few courses for personal enjoyment and enrichment (2)
9. 2 Make up high school deficiencies (2)
10. 6 Other (Please specify: (2))

19. HOW CERTAIN DO YOU FEEL ABOUT ACHIEVING YOUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS?

1. 58 Certain
2. 37 I think I may make it, but it will be hard
3. 5 Doubtful
4. 1 Not likely

(2)

20. DO YOU PLAN TO TRANSFER FROM THIS INSTITUTION?

1. 65 Yes (If yes, please answer all following questions)
2. 35 No (If no, please skip to item 24)

(4)

21. IF YOU PLAN TO TRANSFER, WHAT DEGREE DO YOU HOPE TO ATTAIN?

1. 66 Bachelor's
2. 23 Master's
3. 11 Ph.D. or professional degree (such as in law, medicine, etc.)
4. ____ Does not apply

(44)

22. WHEN DO YOU EXPECT TO TRANSFER?

1. 26 Next semester
2. 20 After one year
3. 33 After two years
4. 20 Undecided
5. ____ Does not apply

(40)

23. IF YOU ARE PLANNING TO TRANSFER TO ANOTHER SCHOOL, PLEASE INDICATE WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL YOU ARE PLANNING TO ATTEND.

1. 2 Public junior college
2. 0 Private junior college
3. 3 Public teachers college
4. 0 Private teachers college
5. 34 Public four-year college
6. 7 Private four-year college
7. 45 Public university
8. 5 Private university
9. 4 Other (Please specify: ________________________)
10. ______ Does not apply

(41)

24. (A) ARE YOU NOW ENROLLED IN REMEDIAL COURSES OR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES?

1. 17 Yes
2. 83 No

(7)

(B) IF YES, IN WHICH COURSES ARE YOU NOW ENROLLED?

1. 64 English (84)
2. 50 Mathematics (84)
3. Other (Please specify: 19 (84))
4. Does not apply

(C) IF YOU HAVE COMPLETED ANY REMEDIAL COURSES OR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, DID YOU EARN A "C" OR BETTER? (Please check for each course.)

	Yes	No	Does not apply /N.A.
1. English	94	6	(77)
2. Mathematics	88	12	(83)
3. Other (Please specify ________________)	78	22	(96)

25. ARE YOU NOW ATTENDING THE COLLEGE OF YOUR CHOICE?

1. 83 Yes
2. 17 No

(2)

26. IF YOU COULD HAVE PICKED ANY COLLEGE YOU WANTED, WHAT KIND WOULD YOU HAVE CHOSEN?

1. __54__ This school
2. __3__ Another junior college
3. __26__ A state college or university
4. __11__ A private college or university
5. __5__ Technical or business college
6. __2__ Other (Please specify: ______________________)

(5)

27. WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS WHY YOU ENTERED COLLEGE? (Please write "1" next to the most important reason, "2" for the next important, and "3" for the third most important.)

1st	2nd	3rd	
34	21	7	To obtain skills and training for a job
2	3	4	I didn't know what else to do
36	22	8	To enter a career in business or a profession
0	1	1	To get married
5	14	18	To develop my knowledge and interest in community and world affairs
2	5	9	My family wanted me to
0	2	5	For the social life
9	18	20	To get a broad liberal education and appreciation of ideas
0	1	1	For the athletics
0	0	0	To take part in student government or activities
0	0	2	To be with my friends
1	1	2	My employer requested it
1	2	3	To make up some high school deficiencies
5	9	15	To take several courses for personal enjoyment and enrichment
5*	2	5	Other (Please specify: ______________________)
(10)	(16)	(19)	

28. HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU THINK IT IS TO YOUR PARENTS THAT YOU FINISH COLLEGE?

1. __41__ Very important
2. __35__ Important
3. __12__ Not too important
4. __5__ Of little or no importance
5. __8__ They haven't expressed a concern one way or another
6. ______ Does not apply

(14)

29. HOW IMPORTANT IS FINISHING COLLEGE TO *YOU*?

1. 58 Very important
2. 29 Important
3. 10 Not too important
4. 3 Of little or no importance

(2)

30. (A) WE ALL HAVE DIFFERENT PREFERENCES AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP OF DIFFERENT CHOICES AND TRAITS TO IMPORTANT COLLEGE AND SUBSEQUENT CAREER EXPERIENCES. (Please mark "yes" for all the items you generally like; mark "no" for those you do not generally like.)

I generally like:	Yes	No	N.A.
1. Unquestioning obedience	28	72	(5)
2. Strict law enforcement	50	50	(5)
3. The tried and true	61	39	(10)
4. Determination and ambition	96	4	(3)
5. Strong family ties	77	23	(4)
6. Unwavering patriotism	42	58	(8)
7. Perfect balance in composition	53	47	(10)
8. Novel experiences	75	25	(6)
9. Predictable outcomes to problems	61	39	(6)
10. Original work	93	7	(4)
11. A set schedule of activities	46	54	(5)
12. A proper place for everything	70	30	(4)
13. The one right answer to questions	45	56	(5)
14. Friends without complex problems	53	47	(6)
15. Straight-forward reasoning	89	11	(4)
16. Dealing with new or strange ideas	91	9	(3)
17. The perfectly completed object	61	39	(8)
18. Quick unhesitating decisions	42	58	(5)
19. Original research work	81	19	(6)
20. To draw my own conclusions	95	5	(3)
21. Solving long, complex problems	48	52	(5)
22. Critical consideration of theories	64	36	(7)
23. Science and mathematics	53	47	(5)
24. Contemplating the future of society	69	31	(5)
25. Men interested in ideas	92	8	(4)

	Yes	No	N.A.
26. Discovering how things work	92	8	(4)
27. Scientific displays	62	38	(5)
28. Detecting faulty reasoning	79	21	(6)

(B) (Please mark "yes" for those adjectives that you think are generally descriptive of you; mark "no" for those that are not.)

I generally am:

	Yes	No	N.A.
1. Well-organized	65	35	(3)
2. Practical	87	13	(2)
3. Individualistic	84	16	(4)
4. Questioning	84	16	(3)
5. Predictable	40	60	(4)
6. Open-minded	92	9	(3)
7. Introspective	72	28	(15)
8. Experimental	75	25	(3)
9. Creative	69	31	(3)
10. Undistracted	26	74	(6)
11. Analytical	64	37	(9)
12. Critical-minded	62	38	(5)
13. Scientific	36	64	(5)
14. Sociable	84	16	(3)
15. Contemplative	82	18	(9)
16. Dutiful	77	23	(6)
17. Determined	92	8	(4)
18. Conventional	56	44	(7)
19. Unrestrained	46	54	(8)
20. Adaptable	94	7	(4)
21. Permissive	69	31	(7)
22. Worried	45	55	(5)
23. Happy	88	12	(4)
24. Calm	73	27	(4)
25. Self-confident	73	28	(5)
26. Nervous	37	63	(5)
27. Anxious	61	39	(4)
28. Restless	53	47	(4)

41. INDICATE WHETHER YOU OR YOUR PARENTS ENGAGE IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES. (Please check all that apply. Check for Mother, Father and self.)

	Mother	Father	Self
1. Read many books	41	31	56
2. Read many magazines such as TIME, NEWSWEEK, LIFE, EBONY, Etc.	44	42	62
3. Discuss politics frequently	24	45	44
4. Read daily newspaper	77	85	74
5. Active in professional or labor organizations	9	26	12
6. Attend concerts, plays or art shows	20	13	51
7. Participate in local politics	13	18	14
8. Belong to a community organization	28	26	22
9. Voted in the last election	81	81	43
10. Do volunteer work for a charitable organization	28	14	24
11. Follow sports closely	12	52	46
12. Usually watch TV news every night	64	72	59
13. Frequently buy pop records	4	3	40
14. Watch TV for entertainment almost every night	64	58	42
	(10)	(16)	(1)

VOCABULARY

42. THIS VOCABULARY "TEST" IS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE WORD POWER OF COLLEGE STUDENTS. SOME OF THE WORDS ARE VERY DIFFICULT. ONLY A FEW PEOPLE CAN DEFINE ALL OF THEM CORRECTLY, SO DO NOT BE SURPRISED IF SOME OR MANY OF THEM ARE UNFAMILIAR TO YOU. THE WORDS TO BE DEFINED ARE PRINTED IN CAPITAL LETTERS. UNDERNEATH EACH OF THESE CAPITALIZED WORDS, LOOK FOR A WORD THAT COMES CLOSEST TO THE SAME MEANING AND FILL IN THE LINE IN FRONT OF THAT WORD. DO NOT CONSULT A DICTIONARY.

SPACE 93%* (2)
1. ___school
2. ___room
3. ___captain
4. ___board
5. ___[illegible]

LIFE 99% (1)
1. ___sorrow
2. ___farm
3. ___color
4. ___[illegible]
5. ___fate

CONCERN 79% (2)
1. ___[illegible] clearly
2. ___hang
3. ___[illegible]
4. ___[illegible]
5. ___hate to work

* Percent correct

BROADEN =98%(2)
1. ____effacе
2. ____make level
3. ____elapse
4. ____embroider
5. ____widen

BLUNT=90%(3)
1. ____dull
2. ____drowsy
3. ____deaf
4. ____doubtful
5. ____ugly

ACCUSTOM=62%(3)
1. ____disappoint
2. ____customary
3. ____encounter
4. ____get used
5. ____business

CHIRRUP =30%(20)
1. ____aspen
2. ____joyful
3. ____capsize
4. ____chirp
5. ____incite

EDIBLE =95%(5)
1. ____suspicious
2. ____eligible
3. ____fit to eat
4. ____sagacious
5. ____able to speak

PACT =92%(7)
1. ____puissance
2. ____remonstrance
3. ____agreement
4. ____skillet
5. ____pressure

SOLICITOR =57%(13)
1. ____lawyer
2. ____chieftain
3. ____watchman
4. ____maggot
5. ____constable

ALLUSION =36%(11)
1. ____aria
2. ____illusion
3. ____eulogy
4. ____dream
5. ____reference

CAPRICE=45%(17)
1. ____value
2. ____a star
3. ____grimace
4. ____whim
5. ____inducement

ANIMOSITY =74%(11)
1. ____hatred
2. ____animation
3. ____disobedience
4. ____diversity
5. ____friendship

EMANATE =37%(17)
1. ____populate
2. ____free
3. ____prominent
4. ____rival
5. ____come

MADRIGAL =66%(25)
1. ____song
2. ____mountebank
3. ____lunatic
4. ____ribald
5. ____sycophant

CLOISTERED=45%(14)
1. ____miniature
2. ____bunched
3. ____arched
4. ____malady
5. ____secluded

ENCOMIUM =30%(35)
1. ____repetition
2. ____friend
3. ____panegyric
4. ____abrasion
5. ____expulsion

PRISTINE=47%(26)
1. ____flashing
2. ____earlier
3. ____primeval
4. ____bound
5. ____green

FACILITY =16%(17)
1. ____tangibility
2. ____grace
3. ____subtlety
4. ____extensibility
5. ____manageableness

SEDULOUS =25%(27)
1. ____muddied
2. ____sluggish
3. ____stupid
4. ____assiduous
5. ____corrupting

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
STUDENT FORM A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

33. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

1. 61 Single
2. 32 Married
3. 6 Divorced or Separated
4. 1 Widowed

34. IF YOU ARE MARRIED, HOW MANY CHILDREN DO YOU HAVE?

1. 29 None
2. 25 One
3. 20 Two
4. 15 Three
5. 5 Four
6. 5 Five or more
7. (62) Does not apply /N.A.

35. WHAT IS YOUR RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND THAT OF YOUR PARENTS? (Please check each column; if your parents are deceased, indicate their religious affiliation when they were alive.)

	Self	Father	Mother
1. Catholic	37	37	38
2. Jewish	1	2	2
3. Protestant	41	46	48
4. None	11	7	3
5. Other (Please specify:)	10	8	10
6. Does not apply/N.A.	(6)	(9)	(5)

36. WHAT IS YOUR MILITARY STATUS?

1. 3 Presently in active service
2. 27 Veteran using G.I. Bill
3. 13 Veteran but not using the G.I. Bill
4. 57 Never served
5. (43) Does not apply /N.A.

37. (A) WAS A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH SPOKEN IN YOUR HOME DURING CHILDHOOD?

1. 77 No
2. 23 Yes
3. (2) Does not apply /N.A.

(B) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY WHAT LANGUAGE ____________

38. WITH WHOM DO YOU LIVE?

1. 47 Parents
2. 3 Guardian, relatives
3. 31 Married (live with my spouse)
4. 15 Friends or by myself
5. 0 Dormitory, fraternity, sorority
6. 7 Other (please specify: ____________)

(1) N.A.

39. DO YOU EXPECT TO LIVE IN THIS COMMUNITY AFTER YOU FINISH YOUR STUDIES?

1. 44 Yes
2. 56 No
3. (35) I do not know /N.A.

40. PLEASE INDICATE, BY WRITING IN THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE, HOW MUCH FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR YOUR EDUCATION YOU RECEIVE FROM THE FOLLOWING SOURCES.

↑ 100%	↑ 75%	↑ 50%	↑ 25%	↑ 0%	
7	2	8	12	70	My own savings (35)
21	4	10	18	47	My own income (35)
6	2	9	9	74	Family support (by providing room and board) (35)
4	2	6	7	81	Family support (other than room and board) (35)
4	1	3	1	91	Spouse (35)
1	0	1	2	96	Scholarship (Please specify: ____________) (35)
1	1	1	2	95	Loan (Please specify: ____________) (34)
3	1	4	3	82	G.I. Bill (35)
2	1	1	1	95	Other government benefits (Please specify: ____________ ____________) (35)
4	1	2	1	92	Other (Please specify: ____________) (35)

41. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE FINANCES A PROBLEM IN TERMS OF YOUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS?
    1. 41 Not a problem
    2. 32 Minor problem
    3. 19 Difficult problem
    4. 8 Serious problem

    (1) N.A.

42. ARE LOANS OR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS AT YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE THROUGH THE STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES?
    1. 66 Yes (Please give examples: ______________________________)
    2. 4 No
    3. (39) I don't know/N.A.
    4. 31 I think so

43. HAVE YOU EVER HEARD OF ANY LOANS, SCHOLARSHIPS OR WORK STUDY PROGRAMS FUNDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS?
    1. 42 Yes (Please specify: ______________________________)
    2. 58 No

    (6) N.A.

44. HAVE YOU EVER TRIED TO GET A SCHOLARSHIP OR LOAN WHILE ENROLLED IN THIS SCHOOL?
    1. 84 No
    2. 4 Yes, but none were available
    3. 5 Yes, but was unsuccessful for other reasons
    4. 7 Yes, I received a loan or scholarship (Please specify: ______________________________)

    (1) N.A.

45. IF YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED OR HAVE BEEN RECENTLY EMPLOYED, WHAT TYPE OF WORK DO YOU DO?
    1. 17 General worker (such as custodian, farm laborer, general and domestic laborer)
    2. 31 Semi-skilled worker (such as machine operator, retail clerk, waitress, truck driver, mail carrier, barber)
    3. 19 Skilled clerical or sales (such as bookkeeper, sales representative, secretary)
    4. 9 Skilled craftsman or foreman (such as electrician, baker, carpenter, bricklayer, factory foreman)
    5. 3 Protective service worker (such as policeman, military, fireman)
    6. 2 Owner or manager of small business or firm (such as insurance – real estate agent, store proprietor, contractor)

7. 1 Farm owner or manager
8. 10 Semi-professional or technician (such as programmer, lab technician)
9. 8 Managerial and professional I (such as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, school teacher, engineer, certified public accountant)
10. 1 Managerial and professional II (such as physician, professor, lawyer)
11. 0 Housewife
12. (16) Do not know / N.A.
13. ___ Does not apply

16. IF YOU ARE PRESENTLY WORKING, INDICATE THE MAJOR REASON FOR YOUR EMPLOYMENT

1. 53 I work to support myself or my own family
2. 18 I need the money to pay for my education
3. 18 I work primarily to get extra spending money for entertainment, clothes, car expenses, etc.
4. 0 I work to help support my parents
5. 6 I like my job
6. 5 Other (Please specify: ___
7. (44) Does not apply/N.A.

17. HOW DOES WORKING AFFECT YOUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS? (Please check all that apply)

1. 32 I don't work (3)
2. 32 I have less time to study (3)
3. 26 I've had to carry fewer courses (3)
4. 9 I've had to drop a course (3)
5. 11 I've earned a lower grade in a class (3)
6. 3 I've failed a class (3)
7. 26 It will take me longer to finish school (3)
8. 5 I may have to withdraw from school temporarily (3)
9. 3 I may not be able to finish school (3)
10. 19 Has no effect (3)
11. -- Does not apply

18. IF EMPLOYED, HOW IS YOUR PRESENT JOB RELATED TO YOUR COURSE OF STUDY?

1. 31 Directly related to my course of study
2. 26 In a related, but different area
3. 43 Not related
4. (3) Does not apply/N.A.

19. (A) DO YOU PLAN TO MAKE A CAREER OF YOUR RECENT OR PRESENT OCCUPATION?

	Yes	No	Does not apply/N.A.
1. Recent occupation	17	83	(41)
2. Present occupation	41	59	(8)

(B) PLEASE DESCRIBE AS BEST YOU CAN THE NATURE OF THE WORK YOU DO OR RECENTLY DID. State exactly what work you do or recently did and at what kind of place you work or recently worked. For example: "I sell clothes in a department store."

1. Recent occupation: ____________________

2. Present occupation: ____________________

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
STUDENT FORM B

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND STATUS

33. WHAT TYPE OF HIGH SCHOOL DID YOU ATTEND? (If you attended more than one type of school, please check the type last attended.)

1. 4 Public trade-technical school
2. 81 Public regular high school
3. 17 Catholic
4. 1 Other church-related
5. 2 Private-independent
6. (3) Does not apply /N.A.

34. WHAT KIND OF PROGRAM DID YOU TAKE IN HIGH SCHOOL?

1. 41 College preparatory
2. 47 General
3. 4 Vocational arts
4. 9 Business
5. (5) Does not apply /N.A.

35. HOW MUCH DO YOU FEEL YOU BENEFITED FROM THE FOLLOWING EXPERIENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL? (Please check each item.)

	Not at all	Some	A lot	Does not apply /N.A.
1. Classroom learning activities	5	52	43	(3)
2. Social activities	19	50	31	(5)
3. Activities in school organizations	29	44	28	(8)
4. Athletic activities	28	41	31	(10)
5. Vocational classes	30	42	27	(27)
6. Business classes	28	44	28	(24)

36. DURING HIGH SCHOOL, WITH WHOM AND TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU DISCUSS YOUR EDUCATIONAL PLANS AND VOCATIONAL INTERESTS? (Please check all that apply.)

	Very Often	Often	Infrequently	Not at all	N.A.
1. Parents	21	32	34	13	(3)
2. Counselor	7	23	43	27	(5)
3. Teacher	6	19	37	38	(6)
4. Brother or sister	9	23	28	40	(9)

	Very Often	Often	Infrequently	Not at all	N.A.
5. Other adults	4	18	46	31	(8)
6. Friends	18	41	30	10	(6)
7. Minister, priest, or rabbi	2	3	13	82	(10)

37. APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY OF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL FRIENDS WENT TO COLLEGE?

1. 20 All, or nearly all
2. 29 Most
3. 22 About half
4. 15 Less than half
5. 15 Very few

(2) N.A.

38. WHEN DID YOU DECIDE TO GO TO COLLEGE?

1. 30 After I graduated from high school
2. 16 During my last year in high school
3. 12 During my junior year in high school
4. 5 During my sophomore year in high school
5. 10 Earlier than any of the above
6. 27 I always took it for granted
7. (14) I don't remember/N.A.

39. (A) HOW MUCH INFLUENCE DID EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE HAVE ON YOUR DECISION TO ATTEND COLLEGE? (Please check each item.)

Most influence		Much	Some	Little or None	N.A.
52	1. Parents	45	28	26	(5)
6	2. Counselors	12	32	56	(7)
6	3. Teachers	13	35	52	(7)
13	4. Other adults	16	40	44	(7)
23	5. Members of my own age group	25	43	32	(6)
(25) N.A.					

(B) Who influenced you most? ____________________
(Enter one of the above and its number)

40. HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOLING DID YOU COMPLETE BEFORE YOU ENROLLED IN COLLEGE?

1. 93 Earned a high school diploma
2. 4 11 years
3. 2 10 years
4. 1 9 years
5. 1 8 years or less

(1) N.A.

41. (A) IS THIS THEN THE FIRST COLLEGE YOU HAVE ATTENDED?

1. 69 Yes

2. 31 No

(1) N.A.

(B) IF THIS IS NOT THE FIRST COLLEGE YOU HAVE ATTENDED, WHAT TYPE OF COLLEGE DID YOU FIRST ATTEND?

1. 37 Another junior college

2. 34 A public university or state college

3. 15 A private four-year college or university

4. 11 A private trade school or business college

5. 4 An extension center

6. (70) Does not apply /N.A.

(C) IF YOU DID ATTEND ANOTHER COLLEGE AND DID NOT GRADUATE, PLEASE INDICATE THE REASONS WHY YOU DID NOT FINISH. (Check

N.A. as many as apply.)

(74) 1. 20 Academic difficulties – poor grades

(74) 2. 23 Financial problems

(74) 3. 17 Moved from the area

(74) 4. 17 Military service (drafted or enlisted)

(74) 5. 11 The school did not offer the courses I wanted

(74) 6. 13 Illness or personal problems

(74) 7. 17 I lost interest in school

(74) 8. 8 I really didn't know what it was all about

(74) 9. 23 I wasn't clear about what I wanted to do

(74) 10. 20 Other

11. ____ Does not apply

12. WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS YOU CHOSE *THIS PARTICULAR COLLEGE?* (Please check only 3 items, using the following code: 1 = most important, 2 = next most important, 3 = third most important)

③	②		①	
23	25	1.	29	Low cost
20	38	2.	20	Close to home
19	14	3.	27	The particular courses I wanted were offered here
8	8	4.	8	I hope to get my grades up and enter a four-year school
7	2	5.	1	Lots of my friends are here
2	1	6.	1	A staff member of this college told me about it
1	1	7.	0	Athletic program
1	1	8.	0	Other extra curricular activities
4	3	9.	1	The advice of a high school teacher or counselor
3	2	10.	1	It's the only school in the area
3	1	11.	1	I don't know what else to do, I don't really know why
2	2	12.	3	It's the only school I could get into because my grades were low
1	1	13.	1	It's the only school I could get into because other schools were full
6	3	14.	8	Other (Please specify: ______)
(19)	(15)		(10)	

13. (A) HAVE YOU EVER WITHDRAWN FROM THE COLLEGE YOU ARE NOW ATTENDING?

1. 21 Yes
2. 79 No

(2)

(B) IF YES, WHY DID YOU WITHDRAW?

1. 3 Academic difficulties
2. 19 Financial problems
3. 5 Moved from the area
4. 7 Military service (drafted or enlisted)
5. 3 The school did not offer the courses I wanted
6. 25 Illness or personal problems
7. 17 I lost interest in school
8. 21 Other (Please specify: ______
9. (81) Does not apply/N.A.

(C) IF YOU WITHDREW FROM THIS COLLEGE AT ANY TIME, HOW LONG WERE YOU OUT OF SCHOOL?

1. 60 1 semester or quarter
2. 18 1 year
3. 10 2 years
4. 8 3 – 5 years
5. 4 Over 5 years
6. (83) Does not apply

14. IF YOU DROPPED OUT OF ANY OTHER COLLEGE, HOW LONG WERE YOU OUT OF SCHOOL?

1. 20 1 semester or quarter
2. 19 1 year
3. 11 2 years
4. 25 3 – 5 years
5. 26 Over 5 years
6. (81) Does not apply

15. (A) IS YOUR INSTITUTION ON THE QUARTER OR SEMESTER SYSTEM?

1. 73 Semester
2. 27 Quarter

(3) N.A.

(B) HOW MANY TERMS (SEMESTERS OR QUARTERS) HAVE YOU ATTENDED THIS COLLEGE? (Exclude summer sessions, unless they were regular term.)

1. 36 One
2. 16 Two
3. 28 Three
4. Four
5. 14 Five
6. Six
7. 2 Seven
8. 5 Eight or more

(2) N.A.

46. HAVE YOU EARNED A DEGREE OR POST-HIGH SCHOOL CERTIFICATE?

1. __80__ No
2. __12__ Yes, a certificate
3. __5__ Yes, an Associate of Arts degree
4. __2__ Yes, a Bachelor's degree
5. __1__ Yes, a graduate degree

(5) N.A.

47. HOW MANY HOURS DO YOU SPEND EACH WEEK IN CLASS, STUDYING OUTSIDE OF CLASS, AND IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES? (Please check each column.)

	Studying	In class	In extra-curricular activities
1. 0 – 3 hours	24	18	58
2. 4 – 6 hours	28	18	14
3. 7 – 9 hours	17	10	8
4. 10 – 12 hours	13	11	7
5. 13 – 15 hours	8	18	3
6. 16 – 18 hours 7. 19 or more hours	10	26	12
N.A.	(7)	(5)	(28)

48. HOW MUCH DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES IN HIGH SCHOOL AND CURRENTLY, IN COLLEGE? (Please mark the extent of your participation in each type of activity listed below.)

		IN HIGH SCHOOL			IN COLLEGE			
	N.A.	Very much 1	Some 2	little/none 3	Very much 1	Some 2	little/none 3	N.A.
1. Sports	(4)	27	36	37	4	13	83	(9)
2. Publications	(8)	6	18	76	1	6	93	(11)
3. Debate	(9)	4	19	77	2	12	86	(11)
4. Music, Art, Drama Activities	(6)	24	29	47	6	14	80	(11)
5. Student government	(7)	8	25	67	2	8	89	(11)
6. Religious groups	(8)	9	21	70	4	8	88	(11)
7. Social groups fraternities, etc.	(8)	10	25	65	5	14	81	(11)
8. Political groups	(8)	3	9	88	2	8	90	(11)
9. Other Academic groups or clubs related to your school work	(8)	14	33	53	4	15	81	(11)

49. IF YOU COULD HAVE ATTENDED ANY COLLEGE YOU WANTED, WHICH TYPE OF SCHOOL WOULD YOU HAVE CHOSEN?

~~1. ____ This college~~
~~2. ____ Another junior college~~
~~3. ____ A state college or university~~
~~4. ____ A private college or university~~
~~5. ____ Technical or business college~~

DUPLICATE

50. PEOPLE HAVE MANY DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF LIFE, WHICH ARE RELATED TO THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT WAYS. THE FOLLOWING BRIEF SECTION ASKS ABOUT YOUR PERCEPTIONS. (Below are paired statements. For *each* pair, check "a" or "b" for that statement which more closely reflects your own feelings. Please check *one* statement for *each* item.)

N.A.

(4) 1. a. _69_ In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. _32_ Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

(4) 2. a. _70_ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. _30_ Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

(5) 3. a. _46_ People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.
b. _54_ Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do well, it's their own fault.

(5) 4. a. _59_ People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. _41_ There's not much use in trying too hard to please people. If they like you, they like you.

(5) 5. a. _33_ I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. _67_ Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

(4) 6. a. _68_ What happens to me is my own doing.
b. _32_ Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

(5) 7. a. _84_ In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. _16_ Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

(7) 8. a. _43_ Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. _57_ It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

51. PEOPLE FEEL DIFFERENTLY ABOUT THEMSELVES AT DIFFERENT TIMES. PLEASE ANSWER THESE STATEMENTS IN TERMS OF THE WAY YOU USUALLY FEEL ABOUT YOURSELF.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others	56	41	2	0	(2)
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities	46	53	1	0	(1)
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	1	4	46	49	(2)
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people	32	62	5	1	(1)
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of	3	10	38	48	(2)
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself	31	59	10	1	(3)
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	19	53	25	3	(2)
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself	5	28	43	25	(2)
9. I certainly feel useless at times	5	44	33	18	(2)
10. At times I think I am no good at all	3	24	35	38	(2)

52. PLEASE INDICATE HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT *EACH* STATEMENT BELOW.
(Please check the appropriate column for each statement.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	N.A.
1. The extent of a man's ambition to better himself is a pretty good indication of his character.	39	42	12	2	5	1	(2)
2. In order to merit the respect of others, a person should show the desire to better himself.	27	44	16	3	7	3	(2)
3. One of the things you should consider in choosing your friends is whether they can help you make your way in the world.	2	6	17	36	31	8	(2)
4. Ambition is the most important factor in determining success in life.	26	34	18	5	12	5	(3)
5. One should always try to live in a highly respectable residential area, even though it entails sacrifices.	2	7	14	31	38	9	(2)
6. Before joining any civic or political association, it is usually important to find out whether it has the backing of people who have achieved a respected social position.	6	16	17	22	32	8	(3)
7. Possession of proper social etiquette is usually the mark of a desirable person.	5	20	23	18	27	8	(4)
8. The raising of one's social position is one of the more important goals in life	4	15	18	24	30	9	(3)
9. It is worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with the right kind of people	7	25	23	16	21	8	(3)
10. An ambitious person can almost always achieve his goals.	24	42	18	3	8	4	(3)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
STUDENT FORM C

YOUR COUNSELORS AND INSTRUCTORS

33. BELOW IS A LIST OF PROBLEMS COLLEGE STUDENTS SOMETIMES HAVE. IN THE FIRST COLUMN, PLEASE CHECK EACH PROBLEM FOR WHICH YOU HAVE AT SOME TIME NEEDED HELP. WHERE YOU HAVE CHECKED A PROBLEM, INDICATE IN THE SECOND COLUMN IF YOU TALKED TO A COUNSELOR (not a faculty advisor) ABOUT THAT PROBLEM. CHECK THE LAST COLUMN ONLY IF YOU FEEL THE COUNSELOR WAS HELPFUL WITH THAT PROBLEM.

	Needed Help	**Talked to Counselor**	**Counselor Was Helpful**
1. The meaning of my test scores	32 (20)	23 (29)	20 (37)
2. Improving my grades	34 (20)	17 (29)	12 (37)
3. Changing my major	33 (20)	30 (29)	25 (37)
4. Changing my occupational plans	24 (20)	18 (29)	14 (37)
5. Improving my study habits	32 (20)	12 (29)	9 (37)
6. Staying in school	17 (20)	13 (29)	10 (37)
7. Getting off academic probation	9 (20)	7 (29)	4 (37)
8. Selecting good classes	65 (19)	62 (28)	54 (37)
9. Selecting good instructors	30 (20)	16 (29)	12 (37)
10. Selecting a transfer college	26 (20)	21 (29)	15 (37)
11. Future educational plans	39 (19)	32 (29)	24 (37)
12. Personal or social problems	21 (20)	11 (29)	9 (37)
13. Problems with family	12 (20)	4 (29)	4 (37)
14. Understanding myself better	20 (20)	8 (29)	8 (37)
15. Understanding the rules and procedure of the college	18 (20)	16 (29)	13 (37)
16. Obtaining employment while in college	24 (20)	14 (29)	9 (37)
17. Finding employment after finishing my studies	12 (20)	6 (29)	4 (37)
18. Obtaining financial aid	28 (20)	21 (29)	16 (37)

34. IS IT EASY TO MAKE AN APPOINTMENT WITH YOUR COUNSELOR?

1. 37 Very easy
2. 39 Not too difficult
3. 5 Very difficult
4. 19 I've never tried

(4) N.A.

35. HOW LONG IS YOUR AVERAGE SESSION WITH YOUR COUNSELOR?

1. 14 Less than 15 minutes
2. 53 Between 15 to 30 minutes
3. 6 Between 30 to 60 minutes
4. 1 I've never seen my counselor

(25) N.A.

36. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE COUNSELOR YOU SEE MOST ON THE DESCRIPTION TRAITS LISTED BELOW? (Please check from "Very Good" (1) to "Poor" (4) for each trait.)

	1 Very	2 Above average	3 Below average	4 Poor	N.A.
1. Warm	36	50	12	3	(30)
2. Informative	38	48	11	3	(30)
3. Concerned	37	45	13	5	(29)
4. Open-minded	37	50	11	3	(30)
5. Intelligent	45	50	4	1	(30)
6. Aware	39	46	12	3	(31)
7. Easy to talk to	47	42	8	3	(29)
8. Patient	44	43	10	3	(30)
9. Sympathetic	30	48	17	6	(34)
10. Does not apply	-	-	-	-	-

37. WHEN I SEE MY COUNSELOR:

1. 29 He/She usually leaves the decisions entirely up to me.
2. 61 We work together on the decisions.
3. 10 He/She usually tells me what to do.
4. (31) Does not apply. / N.A.

38. IF YOU ARE A CONTINUING STUDENT HOW MANY TALKS OR SCHEDULED INTERVIEWS DO YOU HAVE WITH YOUR COUNSELOR DURING A SEMESTER?

1. 14 None
2. 45 1
3. 35 2 to 4
4. 6 5 or more
5. (33) Does not apply / N.A.

39. IF YOU ARE A FIRST SEMESTER STUDENT INDICATE THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF TIMES YOU HAVE SEEN A COUNSELOR THIS TERM.

(74) N.A.
9 None
88 1-5 times
3 > 5 times

40. HAS YOUR COUNSELOR GIVEN YOU ADEQUATE INFORMATION ABOUT CAREERS AND OCCUPATIONS?

1. 66 Yes
2. 34 No
3. (46) I don't know } N.A.
4. ____ Does not apply

41. HAS YOUR COUNSELOR GIVEN YOU ACCURATE INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ACADEMIC PROGRAM?

1. 49 Yes
2. 14 No
3. ____ I don't know
4. (37) Does not apply } N.A.

12. WE WOULD LIKE TO BETTER UNDERSTAND SOME OF THE PROBLEMS STUDENTS EXPERIENCE AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THESE PROBLEMS HINDER STUDENTS' ACADEMIC PROGRESS. PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN ON THE RATING SCALE BELOW TO INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS OR FACTORS ARE *INTERFERING* WITH YOUR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE.

RATING SCALE

---

1 A very serious problem that may cause me to drop out of school before I finish.

2 A problem that could cause me to earn lower grades or drop out of school temporarily.

3 Somewhat of a problem, but one that I feel I can deal with.

4 Not a problem.

	1	2	3	4	N.A.
1. I'm disappointed because being in college isn't as interesting or exciting as I thought it would be	4	5	21	70	(4)
2. Some of the courses are too hard for me	3	9	45	43	(4)
3. I miss too many classes because I have trouble with transportation	2	2	8	88	(4)
4. I feel like I'm wasting my time in school	5	4	14	77	(5)
5. I don't think I'm smart enough	2	4	26	69	(5)
6. Too many of the courses that I have to take aren't going to do me any good, so I don't do well in them	4	9	23	64	(4)
7. I don't know how to study	3	10	37	51	(7)
8. Some of my grades are lower than they should be because I wasn't aware of the procedures of dropping courses, prerequisites, etc.	3	5	12	80	(5)
9. I'm so busy that I'm tired all the time	4	7	36	53	(4)
10. I just can't get motivated	4	8	29	59	(5)
11. I fight with my parents a lot	2	3	9	86	(6)
12. I'm undecided about my major or vocational plans	4	5	22	69	(5)
13. My educational background was poor	3	5	29	63	(5)
14. My classes are dull and boring	3	7	28	63	(5)
15. I'm short of money	9	10	34	47	(4)
16. My vocabulary is poor; I don't understand many of the words used in lectures and in the text	2	5	28	64	(5)
17. I only went to school to please my parents	1	1	5	93	(6)
18. I don't like to study	4	6	40	50	(5)
19. I don't care about the future because things like the war and pollution depress me	1	2	12	84	(5)

RATING SCALE

1 A very serious problem that may cause me to drop out of school before I finish.

2 A problem that could cause me to earn lower grades or drop out of school temporarily.

3 Somewhat of a problem, but one that I feel I can deal with.

4 Not a problem.

	1	2	3	4	N.A.
20. I only came to school because I didn't know what else to do	2	3	8	87	(5)
21. I took the wrong courses in high school and have too many deficiencies	2	4	24	70	(5)
22. I have to work too many hours	3	6	27	64	(4)
23. Personal or family illness	2	2	11	86	(5)
24. I am involved in too many outside activities	1	2	18	79	(5)
25. I don't know what I want to do in life	4	5	26	66	(5)
26. I can't read or write well enough	2	3	14	82	(5)
27. I really don't like school	2	3	17	78	(5)
28. I feel unsure of myself in class so I don't do as well as I should	2	5	28	65	(5)
29. I like my major courses, but I have to take too many other courses I'm not interested in	5	8	31	57	(5)
30. I really want to go to work	4	4	18	75	(6)
31. I get depressed or anxious and can't study	5	7	32	57	(5)
32. I spend too much time dating, going to parties, etc.	2	3	17	78	(5)
33. Other (Please specify ______________)	21	11	15	53	(82)

43. IN YOUR OPINION, BASED ON WHAT YOU THINK IS DESIRABLE, WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF YOUR COLLEGE'S STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES? (Please check each appropriate item.)

	Strong	Average	Weak	No Opinion	N.A.
1. Admissions and registration	23	50	18	10	(6)
2. Records and information	19	55	11	16	(7)
3. Guidance and academic counseling	26	43	16	15	(7)
4. Guidance and vocational counseling	23	38	15	23	(7)
5. Placement for work	11	32	18	40	(8)
6. Financial aids	16	33	14	37	(8)
7. Student activities	18	37	23	22	(8)
8. Special counseling for disadvantaged students	17	22	12	49	(8)
9. Special counseling for students with academic problems	18	28	12	43	(8)

44. HAVE YOU TALKED TO AN INSTRUCTOR OUTSIDE OF CLASS ABOUT YOUR ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES IN THE LAST TWO WEEKS?

1. 63 None; I didn't try
2. 2 None; I tried, but the instructor was not available
3. 15 Once
4. 9 Twice
5. 6 Three times
6. 5 Four times
7. ______ Five or more times

(4) N.A.

45. HOW AVAILABLE ARE YOUR INSTRUCTORS TO YOU FOR CONSULTATION OUTSIDE OF CLASS?

1. 49 Readily available and encourage students to come and see them
2. 36 Are generally available
3. 3 Are generally not available
4. 2 Almost never available
5. 11 I have not tried to find out

(3) N.A.

16. USING THE SCALE BELOW, INDICATE TO WHAT EXTENT YOU FEEL THE STATEMENT DESCRIBES THE INSTRUCTORS YOU HAVE HAD AT THIS COLLEGE. PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN ON THE RATING SCALE BELOW TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE.

RATING SCALE

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 Neither agree nor disagree
4 Disagree
5 Strongly disagree

		1	2	3	4	5	N.A.
(292)	1. Are usually well prepared	39	46	11	4	1	(3)
(293)	2. Use examples and illustrations that make material clearer to me	32	48	14	6	1	(3)
(294)	3. Seem to be interested in teaching	40	46	10	3	1	(3)
(295)	4. Seem to be interested in students	37	41	16	4	2	(3)
(296)	5. Usually hold my attention	23	46	20	10	2	(3)
(297)	6. Organize their courses well	24	46	21	7	2	(3)
(298)	7. Grade fairly	27	47	19	5	2	(4)
(299)	8. Encourage students to express their opinions	34	46	15	3	2	(4)
(300)	9. Are intellectually stimulating (they cause you to think)	29	41	21	7	2	(3)
(301)	10. Make assignments clear	27	52	16	4	1	(3)
(302)	11. Know their subject well	41	45	11	2	1	(3)
(303)	12. Require a reasonable amount of work	26	57	13	4	1	(3)
(304)	13. Are easy to talk to outside of class	36	40	18	4	2	(3)

47. COMPARING YOURSELF TO COLLEGE STUDENTS IN GENERAL, PLEASE RATE YOURSELF IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

RATING SCALE

1. Poor
2. Below average
3. Average
4. Above average
5. Outstanding

MOST IMPORTANT									
I	II	III		1	2	3	4	5	N.A.
7	3	3	1. Mechanical ability	13	13	46	23	6	(4)
3	1	2	2. Clerical ability	6	18	52	20	4	(4)
8	5	3	3. Academic ability	1	8	54	32	5	(4)
15	8	8	4. Drive to succeed	2	8	41	36	13	(4)
21	23	13	5. Ability to deal with people	2	6	39	41	14	(4)
1	1	1	6. Homemaking skills	8	14	45	21	8	(6)
3	2	1	7. Artistic ability	15	29	31	18	6	(4)
1	1	1	8. Athletic ability	9	18	44	24	6	(5)
6	8	6	9. Leadership ability	4	16	47	28	5	(4)
10	14	13	10. Understanding of others	1	3	38	42	16	(4)
2	2	2	11. Ability to care for small children	4	10	33	36	17	(4)
2	2	2	12. Study skills	3	21	54	17	5	(4)
2	3	6	13. Emotional adjustment	1	5	56	28	9	(4)
4	5	5	14. Self-confidence (Academic)	2	13	47	29	9	(4)
3	5	10	15. Self-confidence (Social)	2	16	44	29	9	(4)
5	9	12	16. Communication skills	3	8	54	27	8	(4)
4	3	4	17. Mathematic skills	11	22	40	22	5	(4)
3	6	5	18. Creativity	3	13	46	28	9	(4)
0	0	2	19. Physical attractiveness	2	5	61	25	8	(4)
(8)	(9)	(10)	N.A.						

48. FROM THE LIST IN QUESTION 47, WHICH WOULD YOU CONSIDER THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT SKILLS THAT YOU WILL NEED IN YOUR FUTURE VOCATION? INDICATE YOUR CHOICE BY WRITING IN THE NUMBER BEFORE THE SKILL.

1. ______ Most important
2. ______ Second most important
3. ______ Third most important

19. COMPARED TO COLLEGE STUDENTS IN GENERAL, PLEASE RATE YOUR FELLOW STUDENTS AT THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS: PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

RATING SCALE

1. Poor
2. Below average
3. Average
4. Above average
5. Outstanding

	1	2	3	4	5	N.A.
1. Mechanical ability	1	5	75	16	3	(16)
2. Clerical ability	1	9	74	16	1	(16)
3. Academic ability	2	9	64	23	2	(15)
4. Drive to succeed	2	13	58	22	5	(15)
5. Ability to deal with people	2	8	64	22	5	(15)
6. Homemaking skills	2	10	75	11	2	(19)
7. Artistic ability	2	9	64	20	5	(17)
8. Athletic ability	1	10	58	25	6	(17)
9. Leadership ability	2	11	64	20	4	(16)
10. Understanding of others	3	11	61	21	5	(16)
11. Ability to care for small children	3	8	74	12	4	(20)
12. Study skills	3	15	64	16	2	(16)
13. Emotional adjustment	2	10	72	13	3	(17)
14. Self-confidence (Academic)	1	10	68	18	4	(16)
15. Self-confidence (Social)	1	6	65	23	5	(17)
16. Communication skills	2	10	64	21	3	(17)
17. Mathematic skills	2	12	70	14	2	(17)
18. Creativity	2	8	63	23	5	(17)
19. Physical attractiveness	3	5	71	17	5	(16)

TABLES TO CHAPTER 5

TABLE 5-1

STUDENTS' AGE
(in Percent)

Institution by Socioeconomic Level	16-19	20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41 & over
High						
Meade (N=247;W;S)	53.4	24.7	7.7	4.0	3.6	6.5
Quanto (N=229;W;U-S)	68.1	22.3	5.2	2.2	1.3	0.9
Ward (N=227;W;U-S)	4.0	30.4	37.0	9.7	9.3	9.7
Middle						
Kinsey (N=209;W;R)	39.7	36.4	12.9	5.7	2.4	2.9
Newson (N=266;W;R)	71.1	21.8	1.9	1.9	0.0	3.4
Walden (N=225;W;U-S)	50.2	34.7	8.9	2.7	0.4	3.1
Appleton (N=167;M;U-S)	30.5	31.1	13.8	10.2	6.0	8.4
Foster (N=163;M;U)	24.5	44.2	15.3	3.7	5.5	6.7
Langston (N=159;M;U-S)	20.1	39.0	17.0	8.2	6.3	9.4
Shaw (N=231;M;U)	36.8	32.9	10.0	8.7	6.9	4.8
Sherwood (N=185;M;R)	34.1	40.5	10.8	7.0	2.2	5.4
Low						
Manning (N=118;B;U)	24.6	39.8	16.1	14.4	3.4	1.7
Carter (N=237;M;S)	38.4	24.5	10.5	8.4	3.8	14.3
Lowell (N=186;M;U)	22.6	25.8	17.2	12.9	9.7	11.8
Palmerston (N=187;M;R)	47.1	39.0	6.4	3.2	1.1	3.2
TOTAL	39.6	31.5	12.3	6.5	4.0	6.2

TABLE 5-2

STUDENTS' MARITAL STATUS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Single	Married	Divorced/ separated	Widowed
High				
Meade (N=84;W;S)	70.2	25.0	4.8	0.0
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	92.1	7.9	0.0	0.0
Ward (N=89;W;U-S)	27.0	71.9	0.0	1.1
Middle				
Kinsey (N=75;W;R)	58.7	37.3	4.0	0.0
Newson (N=91;W;R)	85.7	12.1	2.2	0.0
Walden (N=77;W;U-S)	75.3	20.8	2.6	1.3
Appleton (N=60;M;U-S)	56.7	31.7	11.7	0.0
Foster (N=56;M;U)	67.9	25.0	7.1	0.0
Langston (N=60;M;U-S)	50.0	30.0	20.0	0.0
Shaw (N=74;M;U)	50.0	44.6	5.4	0.0
Sherwood (N=65;M;R)	49.2	44.6	3.1	3.1
Low				
Manning (N=38;B;U)	50.0	26.3	18.4	5.3
Carter (N=83;M;S)	51.8	41.0	6.0	1.2
Lowell (N=63;M;U)	41.3	44.4	14.3	0.0
Palmerston (N=60;M;R)	78.3	16.7	3.3	1.7
TOTAL	60.8	32.4	6.0	0.8

TABLE 5-3

MARRIED STUDENTS' NUMBER OF CHILDREN
(in Percent*)

Institution by socioeconomic level	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
High						
Meade (N=24;W;S)	20.8	33.3	20.8	12.5	4.2	4.2
Quanto (N=7;W;U-S)	28.6	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	21.2	18.2	30.3	16.7	9.1	4.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=32;W;R)	28.1	28.1	12.5	21.9	3.1	6.3
Newson (N=14;W;R)	35.7	28.6	21.4	14.3	0.0	0.0
Walden (N=20;W;U-S)	45.0	35.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	5.0
Appleton (N=26;M;U-S)	26.9	23.1	30.8	11.5	3.8	0.0
Foster (N=17;M;U)	35.3	35.3	5.9	17.6	5.9	0.0
Langston (N=26;M;U-S)	30.8	19.2	15.4	11.5	11.5	11.5
Shaw (N=35;M;U)	22.9	31.4	17.1	20.0	2.9	5.7
Sherwood (N=32;M;R)	43.8	34.4	15.6	0.0	6.3	0.0
Low						
Manning (N=16;B;U)	18.8	31.3	6.3	18.8	6.3	18.8
Carter (N=39;M;S)	12.8	7.7	35.9	30.8	5.1	7.7
Lowell (N=36;M;U)	30.6	22.2	25.0	13.9	5.6	2.8
Palmerston (N=16;M;R)	62.5	18.8	6.3	6.3	6.3	0.0
TOTAL	28.6	24.6	20.4	15.3	5.4	5.2

*The figures in this table are based on the 1053 students who responded to this item, representing 61 percent of the base sample.

TABLE 5-4

STUDENTS' RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	None	Other
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	53.7	2.4	29.3	9.8	4.9
Quanto (N=74;W;U-S)	62.2	1.4	23.0	4.1	9.5
Ward (N=87;W;U-S)	59.8	1.1	31.0	5.7	2.3
Middle					
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	18.2	1.5	53.0	10.6	16.7
Newson (N=91;W;R)	24.2	0.0	63.7	7.7	4.4
Walden (N=76;W;U-S)	68.4	3.9	15.8	7.9	3.9
Appleton (N=59;M;U-S)	22.0	3.4	40.7	22.0	11.9
Foster (N=49;M;U)	38.8	0.0	38.8	8.2	14.3
Langston (N=52;M;U-S)	21.2	1.9	42.3	25.0	9.6
Shaw (N=72;M;U)	44.4	0.0	43.1	5.6	6.9
Sherwood (N=58;M;R)	8.6	1.7	50.0	20.7	19.0
Low					
Manning (N=34;B;U)	20.6	0.0	47.1	23.5	8.8
Carter (N=80;M;S)	37.5	0.0	45.0	11.3	6.3
Lowell (N=56;M;U)	30.4	1.8	32.1	12.5	23.2
Palmerston (N=52;M;R)	7.7	0.0	63.5	5.8	23.1
TOTAL	37.0	1.3	40.6	11.0	10.0

TABLE 5-5

STUDENTS' RACE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Amer. Indian	Caucasian	Black	Oriental	Mex. Amer.	Puerto Rican
High						
Meade (N=251;W;S)	0.0	96.4	2.8	0.4	0.4	0.0
Quanto (N=227;W;U-S)	0.9	96.9	0.4	0.0	0.4	1.3
Ward (N=222;W;U-S)	0.0	98.6	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=203;W;R)	0.5	92.1	5.9	0.0	1.0	0.5
Newson (N=267;W;R)	0.4	97.8	0.4	0.0	1.5	0.0
Walden (N=224;W;U-S)	0.4	90.6	4.0	0.4	2.2	2.2
Appleton (N=156;M;U-S)	1.9	61.5	26.3	7.7	2.6	0.0
Foster (N=164;M;U)	0.6	54.3	43.3	0.6	1.2	0.0
Langston (N=157;M·U-S)	1.3	48.4	40.1	5.1	4.5	0.6
Shaw (N=221;M;U)	0.5	66.5	3.6	0.5	28.1	0.9
Sherwood (N=182;M;R)	0.5	81.9	13.7	1.6	2.2	0.0
Low						
Manning (N=118;B;U)	0.0	0.8	97.5	0.0	0.8	0.8
Carter (N=236;M;S)	1.3	88.6	0.8	0.0	9.3	0.0
Lowell (N=180;M;U)	1.7	41.7	31.1	6.1	18.3	1.1
Palmerston (N=188;M;R)	0.0	69.7	29.3	0.5	0.5	0.0
TOTAL	0.6	76.9	15.6	1.4	5.0	0.5

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS WHO REPORTED A FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN THEIR HOME DURING CHILDHOOD

Institution by socioeconomic level	Percent
High	
Meade (N=84;W;S)	11.9
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	25.0
Ward (N=87;W;U-S)	29.9
Middle	
Kinsey (N=74;W;R)	18.9
Newson (N=91;W;R)	15.4
Walden (N=78;W;U-S)	39.7
Appleton (N=56;M;U-S)	21.4
Foster (N=55;M;U)	14.5
Langston (N=60;M;U-S)	15.0
Shaw (N=73;M;U)	41.1
Sherwood (N=64;M;R)	15.6
Low	
Manning (N=38;B;U)	13.2
Carter (N=81;M;S)	25.9
Lowell (N=62;M;U)	37.1
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	10.3
TOTAL	23.0

TABLE 5-7

STUDENTS' FAMILY INCOME AT AGE 17
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Under $3,000	$3,001-6,000	$6,001-10,000	$10,001-15,000	$15,001-25,000	Over $25,000
High						
Meade (N=242;W;S)	8.3	10.3	30.6	28.5	17.4	5.0
Quanto (N=219;W;U-S)	3.2	13.7	38.8	30.6	11.9	1.8
Ward (N=218;W;U-S)	4.6	28.9	45.0	15.1	4.1	2.3
Middle						
Kinsey (N=199;W;R)	5.5	21.6	29.1	28.1	12.1	3.5
Newson (N=256;W;R)	5.9	16.4	41.0	27.0	9.0	0.8
Walden (N=209;W;U-S)	4.3	14.8	39.2	33.0	7.7	1.0
Appleton (N=162;M;U-S)	12.3	25.9	25.9	19.1	12.3	4.3
Foster (N=158;M;U)	15.8	27.2	36.7	12.7	6.3	1.3
Langston (N=159;M;U-S)	18.9	29.6	21.4	20.1	8.8	1.3
Shaw (N=216;M;U)	15.7	26.4	26.4	21.8	6.0	3.7
Sherwood (N=181;M;R)	11.0	23.2	27.1	17.7	14.9	6.1
Low						
Manning (N=117;B;U)	29.1	38.5	22.2	9.4	0.9	0.0
Carter (N=226;M;S)	10.6	24.3	28.3	25.2	10.2	1.3
Lowell (N=182;M;U)	24.2	29.1	25.3	15.9	3.8	1.6
Palmerston (N=181;M;R)	21.0	31.5	27.1	13.8	4.4	2.2
TOTAL	11.7	23.1	31.7	22.1	9.0	2.5

TABLE 5-8

STUDENTS' TYPE OF HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	College preparatory	General	Vocational arts	Business
High				
Meade (N=79;W;S)	35.4	57.0	2.5	5.1
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	72.7	9.1	1.3	16.9
Ward (N=68;W;U-S)	39.7	33.8	10.3	16.2
Middle				
Kinsey (N=59;W;R)	54.2	35.6	3.4	6.8
Newson (N=84;W;R)	36.9	58.3	1.2	3.6
Walden (N=77;W;U-S)	40.3	48.1	2.6	9.1
Appleton (N=48;M;U-S)	45.8	45.8	4.2	4.2
Foster (N=58;M;U)	20.7	67.2	1.7	10.3
Langston (N=51;M;U-S)	37.3	54.9	2.0	5.9
Shaw (N=71;M;U)	53.5	42.3	1.4	2.8
Sherwood (N=64;M;R)	29.7	60.9	0.0	9.4
Low				
Manning (N=38;B;U)	21.1	55.3	10.5	13.2
Carter (N=75;M;S)	54.7	37.3	1.3	6.7
Lowell (N=62;M;U)	19.4	53.2	14.5	12.9
Palmerston (N=69;M;R)	33.3	50.7	4.3	10.1
TOTAL	40.7	46.6	3.8	8.8

TABLE 5-9

TIME STUDENTS' DECIDED TO ATTEND COLLEGE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	After high school graduation	Last high school year	Junior high school year	Sophomore high school year	Earlier than sophomore year	Always taken for granted
High						
Meade (N=73;W;S)	20.5	23.3	13.7	2.7	8.2	31.5
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	17.1	13.2	21.1	7.9	11.8	28.9
Ward (N=53;W;U-S)	69.8	15.1	5.7	0.0	3.8	5.7
Middle						
Kinsey (N=63;W;R)	28.6	11.1	9.5	6.3	11.1	33.3
Newson (N=82;W;R)	18.3	19.5	12.2	4.9	6.1	39.0
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	33.3	20.3	10.1	7.2	10.1	18.8
Appleton (N=45;M;U-S)	24.4	8.9	6.7	11.1	22.2	26.7
Foster (N=52;M;U)	46.2	13.5	15.4	5.8	3.8	15.4
Langston (N=43;M;U-S)	25.6	14.0	9.3	0.0	11.6	39.5
Shaw (N=64;M;U)	29.7	14.1	10.9	6.3	14.1	25.0
Sherwood (N=54;M;R)	31.5	11.1	7.4	3.7	3.7	42.6
Low						
Manning (N=36;B;U)	44.4	16.7	5.6	2.8	25.0	5.6
Carter (N=69;M;S)	21.7	17.4	10.1	8.7	8.7	33.3
Lowell (N=51;M;U)	33.3	25.5	7.8	3.9	5.9	23.5
Palmerston (N=53;M;R)	28.3	17.0	22.6	5.7	5.7	20.8
TOTAL	30.1	16.3	11.7	5.3	9.6	27.0

TABLE 5-10

PERSONS WITH WHOM STUDENTS DISCUSSED EDUCATIONAL PLANS AND VOCATIONAL INTERESTS DURING HIGH SCHOOL "OFTEN" OR "VERY OFTEN" (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Parents	Counselors	Teachers	Clergymen	Other adults	Siblings	Friends
High							
Meade (N=77;W;S)	50.1	34.6	13.1	4.1	18.6	29.8	60.2
Quanto (N=75;W;U-S)	59.5	42.9	24.0	5.5	20.5	33.8	60.5
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	38.5	13.8	15.2	3.2	14.1	16.1	40.3
Middle							
Kinsey (N=65;W;R)	50.0	35.4	21.9	4.8	28.6	22.9	66.2
Newson (N=84;W;R)	64.7	42.8	16.7	3.6	22.9	26.5	66.6
Walden (N=75;W;U-S)	45.5	25.3	25.3	4.0	24.6	34.3	67.1
Appleton (N=50;M;U-S)	60.0	27.0	26.0	2.1	29.4	40.0	66.0
Foster (N=59;M;U)	45.9	32.7	29.3	5.1	24.6	38.4	53.4
Langston (N=47,M;U-S)	45.8	21.7	38.3	4.6	27.1	39.1	58.0
Shaw (N=71;M;U)	46.6	28.7	20.9	5.9	23.2	32.4	58.0
Sherwood (N=61;M;R)	60.0	19.3	32.3	1.7	18.0	30.7	58.4
Low							
Manning (N=37;B;U)	79.5	44.8	50.0	20.0	35.1	54.0	71.4
Carter (N=75;M;S)	45.5	18.5	21.0	4.2	17.3	24.7	52.0
Lowell (N=62;M;U)	61.3	16.7	26.7	3.4	25.4	40.6	50.0
Palmerston (N=62;M;R)	61.2	41.8	35.9	6.6	22.4	40.0	69.3
TOTAL	53.6	30.0	25.1	4.8	22.8	32.4	59.6

TABLE 5-11

PERSONS WITH WHOM STUDENTS DISCUSSED EDUCATIONAL PLANS AND VOCATIONAL INTERESTS DURING HIGH SCHOOL
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	PARENTS				COUNSELORS			
	Very often	Often	Infrequently	Not at all	Very often	Often	Infrequently	Not at all
High								
Meade (N=80;W;S)	16.3	33.8	42.5	7.5	1.3	33.3	42.3	23.1
Quanto (N=79;W;U-S)	29.1	30.4	34.2	6.3	11.7	31.2	49.4	7.8
Ward (N=70;W;U-S)	11.4	27.1	40.0	21.4	1.5	12.3	55.4	30.8
Middle								
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	19.7	30.3	40.9	9.1	3.1	32.3	43.1	21.5
Newson (N=85;W;R)	21.2	43.5	28.2	7.1	10.7	32.1	44.0	13.1
Walden (N=79;W;U-S)	13.9	31.6	45.6	8.9	4.0	21.3	48.0	26.7
Appleton (N=50;M;U-S)	24.0	36.0	28.0	12.0	5.8	21.2	42.3	30.8
Foster (N=61;M;U)	19.7	26.2	32.8	21.3	8.6	24.1	36.2	31.0
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	12.5	33.3	31.3	22.9	6.5	15.2	43.5	34.8
Shaw (N=73;M;U)	17.8	28.8	30.1	23.3	8.2	20.5	32.9	38.4
Sherwood (N=65;M;R)	29.2	30.8	30.8	9.2	4.8	14.5	35.5	45.2
Low								
Manning (N=39;B;U)	48.7	30.8	10.3	10.3	13.2	31.6	36.8	18.4
Carter (N=77;M;S)	14.3	31.2	42.9	11.7	5.3	13.2	53.9	27.6
Lowell (N=62;M;U)	22.6	38.7	22.6	16.1	1.7	15.0	35.0	48.3
Palmerston (N=67;M;R)	29.9	31.3	26.9	11.9	13.4	28.4	35.8	22.4
TOTAL	21.2	32.4	33.6	12.9	6.6	23.4	42.7	27.4

TABLE 5-11 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	TEACHERS				SIBLINGS			
	Very often	Often	Infre-quently	Not at all	Very often	Often	Infre-quently	Not at all
High								
Meade (N=76;W;S)	2.6	10.5	42.1	44.7	9.5	20.3	25.7	44.6
Quanto (N=75;W;U-S)	5.3	18.7	46.7	29.3	5.4	28.4	32.4	33.8
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	0.0	15.2	31.8	53.0	3.2	12.9	19.4	64.5
Middle								
Kinsey (N=64;W;R)	9.4	12.5	35.9	42.2	4.9	18.0	36.1	41.0
Newson (N=84;W;R)	2.4	14.3	52.4	31.0	7.2	19.3	39.8	33.7
Walden (N=75;W;U-S)	9.3	16.0	44.0	30.7	12.9	21.4	21.4	44.3
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	9.3	16.7	31.5	42.6	8.0	32.0	34.0	26.0
Foster (N=58;M;U)	3.4	25.9	32.8	37.9	6.7	31.7	21.7	40.0
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	8.5	29.8	27.7	34.0	15.2	23.9	26.1	34.8
Shaw (N=72;M;U)	5.6	15.3	38.9	40.3	11.3	21.1	22.5	45.1
Sherwood (N=65;M;R)	12.3	20.0	30.8	36.9	9.7	21.0	33.9	35.5
Low								
Manning (N=38;B;U)	15.8	34.2	34.2	15.8	18.9	35.1	29.7	16.2
Carter (N=76;M;S)	2.6	18.4	30.3	48.7	5.5	19.2	28.8	46.6
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	5.0	21.7	31.7	41.7	18.6	22.0	18.6	40.7
Palmerston (N=64;M;R)	10.9	25.0	37.5	26.6	11.7	28.3	28.3	31.7
TOTAL	6.4	18.7	37.4	37.6	9.4	23.0	28.0	39.5

TABLE 5-11 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	MINISTER, RABBI, OR PRIEST Very often	Often	Infrequently	Not at all
High				
Meade (N=74;W;S)	2.7	1.4	10.8	85.1
Quanto (N=74;W;U-S)	1.4	4.1	13.5	81.1
Ward (N=62;W;U-S)	0.0	3.2	4.8	91.9
Middle				
Kinsey (N=63;W;R)	3.2	1.6	9.5	85.7
Newson (N=83;W;R)	1.2	2.4	22.9	73.5
Walden (N=75;W;U-S)	1.3	2.7	9.3	86.7
Appleton (N=48;M;U-S)	2.1	0.0	8.3	89.6
Foster (N=58;M;U)	1.7	3.4	10.3	84.5
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	2.3	2.3	11.4	84.1
Shaw (N=68;M;U)	1.5	4.4	10.3	83.8
Sherwood (N=58;M;R)	0.0	1.7	19.0	79.3
Low				
Manning (N=35;B;U)	0.0	20.0	25.7	54.3
Carter (N=72;M;S)	1.4	2.8	11.1	84.7
Lowell (N=59;M;U)	0.0	3.4	16.9	79.7
Palmerston (N=60;M;R)	3.3	3.3	13.3	80.0
TOTAL	1.5	3.3	13.0	82.2

TABLE 5-11 (Continued)

	FRIENDS				OTHER ADULTS			
Institution by socioeconomic level	Very often	Often	Infre-quently	Not at all	Very often	Often	Infre-quently	Not at all
High								
Meade (N=75;W;S)	20.5	39.7	30.8	9.0	1.3	17.3	46.7	34.7
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	18.4	42.1	36.8	2.6	2.7	17.8	56.2	23.3
Ward (N=64;W;U-S)	10.4	29.9	43.3	16.4	1.6	12.5	43.8	42.2
Middle								
Kinsey (N=63;W;R)	18.5	47.7	26.2	7.7	4.8	23.8	42.9	28.6
Newson (N=83;W;R)	22.6	44.0	29.8	3.6	0.0	22.9	49.4	27.7
Walden (N=73;W;U-S)	21.5	45.6	24.1	8.9	2.7	21.9	49.3	26.0
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	26.0	40.0	26.0	8.0	9.8	19.6	47.1	23.5
Foster (N=57 M;U)	16.7	36.7	31.7	15.0	5.3	19.3	40.4	35.1
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	16.0	42.0	38.0	4.0	12.5	14.6	50.0	22.9
Shaw (N=69,M;U)	17.4	40.6	23.2	18.8	8.7	14.5	31.9	44.9
Sherwood (N=61;M;R)	16.9	41.5	35.4	6.2	8.2	9.8	52.5	29.5
Low								
Manning (N=37;B;U)	31.4	40.0	20.0	8.6	8.1	27.0	45.9	18.9
Carter (N=75;M;S)	8.0	44.0	38.7	9.3	1.3	16.0	58.7	24.0
Lowell (N=59;M;U)	20.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	0.0	25.4	32.2	42.4
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	17.7	51.6	14.5	16.1	6.9	15.5	39.7	37.9
TOTAL	18.4	41.2	30.3	10.2	4.4	18.4	46.1	31.1

TABLE 5-12

PERSON WITH GREATEST INFLUENCE ON STUDENTS' COLLEGE ATTENDANCE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Parents	Counselors	Teachers	Other adults	Peers
High					
Meade (N=60;W;S)	53.3	5.0	5.0	8.3	28.3
Quanto (N=59;W;U-S)	59.3	5.1	3.4	10.2	22.0
Ward (N=45;W;U-S)	22.2	4.4	2.2	44.4	26.7
Middle					
Kinsey (N=46;W;R)	60.9	8.7	8.7	6.5	15.2
Newson (N=75;W;R)	64.0	9.3	5.3	6.7	14.7
Walden (N=62;W;U-S)	43.5	4.8	4.8	12.9	33.9
Appleton (N=38;M;U-S)	47.4	10.5	2.6	13.2	26.3
Foster (N=40;M;U)	45.0	5.0	2.5	20.0	27.5
Langston (N=45;M;U-S)	44.4	11.1	4.4	15.6	24.4
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	56.1	3.5	1.8	17.5	21.1
Sherwood (N=57;M;R)	56.1	0.0	8.8	10.5	24.6
Low					
Manning (N=34;B;U)	50.0	5.9	5.9	8.8	29.4
Carter (N=65;M;S)	53.8	3.1	10.8	12.3	20.0
Lowell (N=42;M;U)	54.8	7.1	11.9	11.9	14.3
Palmerston (N=54;M;R)	55.6	11.1	9.3	3.7	20.4
TOTAL	52.0	6.2	5.9	13.0	23.0

TABLE 5-13

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS' HIGH SCHOOL FRIENDS ATTENDING COLLEGE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	All or nearly all	Most	About half	Less than half	Very few
High					
Meade (N=80;W;S)	33.8	30.0	13.8	11.3	11.3
Quanto (N=78;W;U-S)	19.2	34.6	30.8	10.3	5.1
Ward (N=68;W;U-S)	11.8	20.6	26.5	22.1	19.1
Middle					
Kinsey (N=64;W;R)	17.2	40.6	20.3	12.5	9.4
Newson (N=86;W;R)	25.6	44.2	19.8	5.8	4.7
Walden (N=79;W;U-S)	21.5	31.6	13.9	20.3	12.7
Appleton (N=53;M;U-S)	32.1	28.3	13.2	5.7	20.8
Foster (N=62;M;U)	21.0	17.7	19.4	25.8	16.1
Langston (N=52;M;U-S)	9.6	21.2	32.7	15.4	21.2
Shaw (N=71;M;U)	22.5	25.4	26.8	8.5	16.9
Sherwood (N=67;M;R)	25.4	25.4	20.9	17.9	10.4
Low					
Manning (N=38;B;U)	10.5	28.9	21.1	23.7	15.8
Carter (N=78;M;S)	21.8	30.8	23.1	11.5	12.8
Lowell (N=64;M;U)	9.4	21.9	18.8	14.1	35.9
Palmerston (N=69;M;R)	14.5	23.2	24.6	20.3	17.4
TOTAL	20.3	28.8	21.6	14.6	14.7

TABLE 5-14

STUDENTS' MAJOR REASON FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Train for job	Business career	Develop world knowledge	Family wishes	Liberal educ.	Personal enjoyment	Other
High							
Meade (N=233;W;S)	28.3	37.8	4.3	0.9	10.3	5.2	13.4
Quanto (N=212;W;U-S)	34.9	32.1	4.7	1.9	9.9	2.8	13.7
Ward (N=205;W;U-S)	45.4	34.6	2.4	1.0	5.4	4.9	6.4
Middle							
Kinsey (N=186;W;R)	33.3	35.5	4.8	2.2	7.0	8.1	9.2
Newson (N=236;W;R)	33.1	35.2	3.0	4.2	10.2	2.1	12.1
Walden (N=216;W;U-S)	25.0	38.0	5.1	2.3	13.4	4.6	11.6
Appleton (N=158;M;U-S)	25.9	41.1	3.2	0.6	11.4	12.7	16.4
Foster (N=149;M;U)	30.9	41.6	6.0	0.7	8.1	2.7	10.2
Langston (N=145;M;U-S)	37.2	32.4	5.5	0.7	6.9	6.2	18.0
Shaw (N=213;M;U)	25.8	45.5	5.6	1.4	9.4	5.6	6.6
Sherwood (N=173;M;R)	19.1	34.1	12.7	1.7	17.3	5.8	9.3
Low							
Manning (N=104;B;U)	22.1	42.3	18.3	1.0	5.8	2.9	7.8
Carter (N=214;M;S)	37.9	36.0	0.5	1.4	9.8	5.1	9.5
Lowell (N=172;M;U)	52.3	26.2	2.9	1.2	3.5	2.9	11.1
Palmerston (N=169;M;R)	63.9	25.4	5.9	0.6	0.6	1.2	2.4
TOTAL	34.4	35.8	51.0	1.5	8.8	4.8	4.7

TABLE 5-15

MOST IMPORTANT REASON WHY STUDENTS CHOSE THEIR PARTICULAR COLLEGE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Low cost	Close to home	Particular courses	Improve grades & transfer	School accepted low grades	Other schools full	Other
High							
Meade (N=76;W;S)	39.5	18.4	19.7	7.9	1.3	0.0	3.9
Quanto (N=69;W;U-S)	39.1	13.0	27.5	10.1	2.9	2.9	1.4
Ward (N=61;W;U-S)	13.1	21.3	50.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	11.5
Middle							
Kinsey (N=62;W;R)	30.6	16.1	21.0	11.3	6.5	0.0	8.1
Newson (N=79;W;R)	44.3	17.7	17.7	6.3	0.0	1.3	5.1
Walden (N=79;W;U-S)	34.2	16.5	13.9	15.2	11.4	0.0	7.6
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	7.8	27.5	33.3	11.8	2.0	0.0	5.9
Foster (N=54;M;U)	38.9	14.8	22.2	11.1	3.7	0.0	9.3
Langston (N=46;M;U-S)	21.7	28.3	26.1	8.7	2.2	2.2	8.7
Shaw (N=68;M;U)	45.6	23.5	13.2	4.4	1.5	0.0	10.3
Sherwood (N=60;M;R)	13.3	35.0	15.0	11.7	1.7	0.0	16.7
Low							
Manning (N=37;B;U)	45.9	16.2	16.2	8.1	0.0	8.1	5.4
Carter (N=73;M;S)	27.4	32.9	17.8	2.7	1.4	1.4	6.8
Lowell (N=55;M;U)	9.1	5.5	63.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	10.9
Palmerston (N=62;M;R)	14.5	17.7	58.1	0.0	1.6	0.0	3.2
TOTAL	29.1	20.3	27.0	7.5	2.6	0.9	7.5

*Seven reasons on the original item are eliminated from this table because of negligible responses. They are: Friends attend this college; Referred to by staff; Athletic Program; Other extra curricular activities; Advice of high school teacher or counselor; Only school in area; Don't know what else to do.

TABLE 5-16

STUDENTS' IMMEDIATE EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Transfer without AA	Transfer with AA	AA only	Vocat. certif. only	Occupat. prepar. or improve.	Personal enjoy-ment	Other
High							
Meade (N=247;W;S)	29.9	30.1	14.2	4.9	20.7	12.6	5.6
Quanto (N=230;W;U-S)	15.6	45.7	26.5	3.0	15.6	7.4	7.6
Ward (N=224;W;U-S)	4.4	54.0	19.6	0.4	23.6	8.9	7.1
Middle							
Kinsey (N=207;W;R)	28.0	30.4	16.9	3.4	22.7	14.0	10.1
Newson (263;W;R)	14.8	44.9	15.2	12.9	12.5	3.8	4.9
Walden (N=224;W;U-S)	24.1	47.8	9.4	1.8	24.5	14.7	5.8
Appleton (N=167;M;U-S)	19.2	40.1	13.2	6.0	21.5	21.6	10.7
Foster (N=157;M;U)	25.4	40.8	14.0	5.1	24.2	8.3	8.6
Langston (N=163;M;U-S)	20.2	40.5	9.8	6.1	34.9	23.3	14.1
Shaw (N=223;M;U)	34.5	37.2	7.2	1.8	17.0	9.4	9.8
Sherwood (N=183;M;R)	5.5	76.0	9.3	1.1	3.3	7.1	7.7
Low							
Manning (N=117;B;U)	27.3	50.4	9.4	3.4	17.0	4.3	9.4
Carter (N=234;M;S)	12.8	48.7	16.7	9.8	25.6	17.9	6.0
Lowell (N=187;M;U)	10.1	29.4	18.7	12.3	37.4	10.2	14.9
Palmerston (N=181;M;R)	6.0	16.6	38.1	13.8	25.9	1.7	8.3
TOTAL	18.5	42.1	16.1	5.8	21.5	11.0	8.5

TABLE 5-17

STUDENTS' ANTICIPATED TRANSFER DEGREE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Bachelor's degree	Master's degree	Professional degree
High			
Meade (N=147;W;S)	72.1	18.4	9.5
Quanto (N=128;W;U-S)	59.4	28.9	11.7
Ward (N=120;W;U-S)	83.3	11.7	5.0
Middle			
Kinsey (N=123;W;R)	59.3	26.0	14.6
Newson (N=152;W;R)	71.7	17.1	11.2
Walden (N=143;W;U-S)	72.7	16.8	10.5
Appleton (N=95;M;U-S)	54.7	29.5	15.8
Foster (N=104;M;U)	58.7	30.8	10.6
Langston (N=87;M;U-S)	62.1	24.1	13.8
Shaw (N=174;M;U)	70.7	20.1	9.2
Sherwood (N=148;M;R)	62.2	28.4	9.5
Low			
Manning (N=83;B;U)	47.0	31.3	21.7
Carter (N=133;M;S)	61.7	26.3	12.0
Lowell (N=65;M;U)	78.5	15.4	6.2
Palmerston (N=34;M;R)	85.3	8.8	5.9
TOTAL	66.3	22.6	11.1

TABLE 5-18

NUMBER OF SEMESTER UNITS COMPLETED
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	15 or less	16-30	31-45	46-60	61-100	100 or more
High						
Meade (N=230;W;S)	35.7	18.7	17.8	20.0	5.7	2.2
Quanto (N=173;W;U-S)	41.6	24.3	15.0	13.3	5.2	0.6
Ward (N=211;W;U-S)	28.4	17.5	15.2	19.4	13.3	6.2
Middle						
Kinsey (N=192;W;R)	46.4	17.2	19.3	7.8	5.2	4.2
Newson (N=200;W;R)	35.5	24.0	23.5	12.5	4.0	0.5
Walden (N=197;W;U-S)	38.6	20.8	16.8	15.2	6.1	2.5
Appleton (N=33;M;U-S)	30.3	21.2	9.1	15.2	3.0	21.2
Foster (N=147;M;U)	29.9	25.2	20.4	12.2	9.5	2.7
Langston (N=132;M;U-S)	39.4	22.7	7.6	15.2	9.8	5.3
Shaw (N=220;M;U)	35.5	16.8	18.2	16.4	8.6	4.5
Sherwood (N=81;M;R)	24.7	21.0	11.1	22.2	18.5	2.5
Low						
Manning (N=108;B;U)	43.5	23.1	13.9	13.0	4.6	1.9
Carter (N=88;M;S)	27.3	23.9	8.0	13.6	23.9	3.4
Lowell (N=155;M;U)	32.3	20.0	16.1	13.5	12.3	5.8
Palmerston (N=23;M;R)	56.5	26.1	4.3	8.7	4.3	0.0
TOTAL	36.0	20.8	16.3	14.9	8.6	3.5

TABLE 5-19

TYPE OF COURSES IN WHICH STUDENT IS ENROLLED
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Regular credit	Adult education	Non-credit
High			
Meade (N=244;W;S)	86.9	4.9	4.5
Quanto (N=229;W;U-S)	98.7	0.0	1.3
Ward (N=224;W;U-S)	90.2	8.0	0.4
Middle			
Kinsey (N=203;W;R)	94.1	1.5	1.5
Newson (N=267;W;R)	95.5	2.6	1.1
Walden (N=224;W;U-S)	94.2	2.7	2.7
Appleton (N=167;M;U-S)	85.0	9.6	3.0
Foster (N=163;M;U)	90.2	4.9	3.1
Langston (N=157;M;U-S)	76.4	10.2	5.1
Shaw (N=226;M;U)	92.0	2.7	2.7
Sherwood (N=186;M;R)	94.1	1.6	2.7
Low			
Manning (N=117;B;U)	92.3	3.4	0.9
Carter (N=130;M;S)	87.0	9.6	2.6
Lowell (N=183;M;U)	73.8	20.8	4.4
Palmerston (N=185;M;R)	95.1	3.2	2.7
TOTAL	90.1	94.5	2.5

TABLE 5-20

STUDENTS' CURRENT MAJOR
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	TRANSFER PROGRAMS									
	Lib. arts	Social science	Science & math	Fine arts	Human-ities	Medical	Agric.	Educ.	Other professnl.	Total
High										
Meade (N=205;W;S)	11.2	11.2	2.0	6.3	1.0	5.9	1.5	7.8	19.0	65.9
Quanto (N=201;W;U-S)	23.4	7.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	3.5	1.0	6.5	10.4	52.3
Ward (N=202;W;U-S)	4.0	4.5	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	2.5	33.2	47.7
Middle										
Kinsey (N=167;W;R)	12.0	10.8	6.0	4.8	1.8	4.8	1.2	7.2	10.8	59.4
Newson (N=235;W;R)	11.5	7.2	3.4	6.8	4.3	8.5	6.0	6.8	9.8	64.3
Walden (N=189;W;U-S)	12.7	4.2	3.7	4.8	2.6	3.2	0.5	6.3	34.9	72.9
Appleton (N=128;M;U-S)	4.7	19.5	3.9	4.7	3.9	7.8	0.0	6.3	17.2	68.0
Foster (N=135;M;U)	19.3	4.4	0.7	1.5	3.0	8.1	0.0	5.9	17.0	59.9
Langston (N=116;M;U-S)	7.8	15.5	6.9	5.2	3.4	6.0	0.9	6.0	12.1	63.8
Shaw (N=194;M;U)	4.1	12.9	5.2	5.2	3.6	12.4	1.0	10.8	24.2	79.4
Sherwood (N=144;M;R)	7.6	8.3	6.9	2.1	3.5	7.6	2.8	16.7	26.4	81.9
Low										
Manning (N=99;B;U)	4.0	17.2	4.0	4.0	1.0	13.1	0.0	13.1	16.2	72.6
Carter (N=184;M;S)	3.8	12.5	6.5	1.6	2.2	4.9	1.6	3.3	21.2	57.6
Lowell (N=136;M;U)	0.0	2.9	1.5	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	3.7	9.6	19.1
Palmerston (N=164;M;R)	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	10.4	14.0
TOTAL	8.8	8.8	3.4	3.3	2.2	5.6	1.3	6.7	18.5	58.6

TABLE 5-20 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	2-YEAR PROGRAMS						
	Agriculture	Business	Arts	Health services	Public personal services	Trade technical	Total
High							
Meade (N=205;W:S)	0.0	13.2	3.9	5.4	3.4	8.3	34.2
Quanto (N=201;W;U-S)	0.0	24.9	0.0	16.4	3.0	2.5	46.8
Ward (N=202;W;U-S)	0.0	28.7	0.0	1.0	0.5	22.3	52.5
Middle							
Kinsey (N=167;W;R)	0.0	13.2	0.0	6.6	4.2	16.8	40.8
Newson (N=235;W,R)	2.1	17.0	0.4	11.1	0.0	5.1	35.7
Walden (N=189;W;U-S)	0.0	18.5	0.5	2.6	0.5	4.8	26.9
Appleton (N=;28;M;U-S)	0.0	7.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	16.4	32.0
Foster (N=135;M;U)	0.0	8.9	2.2	19.3	4.4	5.2	40.0
Langston (N=116;M;U-S)	0.9	6.0	4.3	2.6	1.7	20.7	35.3
Shaw (N=194;M;U)	0.0	9.3	1.0	6.7	2.6	1.0	20.6
Sherwood (N=144;M;R)	0.0	3.5	0.0	11.1	2.8	0.7	18.1
Low							
Manning (N=99;B;U)	0.0	8.1	0.0	15.2	2.0	2.0	27.3
Carter (N=184;M;S)	0.0	13.0	0.5	8.2	8.2	12.5	42.4
Lowell (N=136;M;U)	0.0	10.3	7.4	5.9	2.2	55.1	80.9
Palmerston (N=164;M;R)	3.7	39.6	4.9	9.1	10.4	18.3	86.0
TOTAL	0.5	15.8	1.6	8.4	3.0	12.0	41.3

TABLE 5-21

STUDENTS' COLLEGE GRADE AVERAGE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	A	B	C+	C	C-	D or below
High						
Meade (N=237;W;S)	7.6	36.7	28.7	20.3	4.6	2.1
Quanto (N=198;W;U-S)	8.1	36.4	29.8	19.7	5.1	1.0
Ward (N=211;W,U-S)	12.3	44.1	25.6	11.4	5.7	0.9
Middle						
Kinsey (N=191;W;R)	15.7	47.6	22.0	10.5	2.1	2.1
Newson (N=236;W;R)	5.1	29.7	28.0	27.5	6.8	3.0
Walden (N=171;W;U-S)	5.3	36.8	30.4	18.1	6.4	2.9
Appleton (N=150;M;U-S)	16.0	44.7	24.0	12.7	0.7	2.0
Foster (N=153;M;U)	9.8	46.4	25.5	13.1	3.3	2.0
Langston (N=130;M;U-S)	15.4	43.8	22.3	13.1	3.8	1.5
Shaw (N=220;M;U)	9.5	39.1	22.3	19.1	5.5	4.5
Sherwood (N=178;M;R)	30.3	50.6	13.5	4.5	1.1	0.0
Low						
Manning (N=104;B;U)	11.5	35.6	31.7	14.4	5.8	1.0
Carter (N=217;M;S)	10.1	41.9	28.6	14.3	3.2	1.8
Lowell (N=154;M;U)	7.8	45.5	29.9	14.9	1.9	0.0
Palmerston (N=177;M;R)	20.9	33.9	20.9	13.6	9.6	1.1
TOTAL	12.0	40.5	25.5	15.6	4.5	1.8

TABLE 5-22

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS WHO REPORTED OVER 50 PERCENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR EDUCATION, BY SOURCE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Own savings	Own income	Family -room & board	Family -other	Spouse	Schol-arship	Loan	G.I. Bill	Other gov't	Other
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	14.9	20.4	13.0	9.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	5.6
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	25.0	10.4	4.2	14.6	6.3	2.1	2.1	4.2	2.1	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	1.5	20.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	22.7	0.0	37.9
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	12.6	14.6	4.2	4.2	8.3	0.0	2.1	10.4	2.1	8.3
Newson (N=63;W;R)	12.6	12.6	8.0	11.1	1.6	3.2	3.2	6.4	6.4	1.6
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	12.2	38.8	10.4	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0
Appleton (N=40;W;U-S)	2.5	33.3	10.3	10.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
Foster (N=39;M;U)	2.6	20.5	5.1	2.6	7.7	2.6	10.3	18.0	5.2	7.7
Langston (N=35;M;U-S)	11.4	45.5	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	7.0	21.1	1.8	7.0	7.1	7.1	5.3	8.8	8.8	0.0
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	2.1	32.0	8.5	2.1	10.6	2.1	2.1	12.7	0.0	2.1
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	7.7	30.7	15.4	7.6	0.0	3.8	0.0	11.5	2.7	0.0
Carter (N=55;M;S)	10.9	34.6	14.5	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	10.3	46.2	7.7	2.6	5.1	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	2.6
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	4.0	16.0	4.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	8.0
TOTAL	9.4	25.5	7.8	5.8	5.1	1.5	1.7	10.7	2.3	4.6

TABLE 5-23

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS WHO REPORTED ANY FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR EDUCATION, BY SOURCE
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Source and proportion of support									
	OWN SAVINGS					OWN INCOME				
	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	59.3	13.0	13.0	1.9	13.0	46.3	20.4	13.0	0.0	20.4
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	47.9	10.4	16.7	0.0	25.0	58.3	20.8	10.4	0.0	10.4
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	89.2	6.2	3.1	0.0	1.5	46.2	21.5	12.3	1.5	18.5
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	62.5	14.6	10.4	6.3	6.3	43.8	27.1	14.6	4.2	10.4
Newson (N=63;W;R)	61.9	15.9	9.5	6.3	6.3	46.0	30.2	11.1	6.3	6.3
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	71.4	8.2	8.2	2.0	10.2	34.7	16.3	10.2	10.2	28.6
Appleton (N=40;W;U-S)	80.0	17.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	38.5	20.5	7.7	5.1	28.2
Foster (N=39;M;U)	71.8	17.9	7.7	0.0	2.6	51.3	20.5	7.7	5.1	15.4
Langston (N=35;M;U-S)	74.3	8.6	5.7	0.0	11.4	33.3	9.1	12.1	0.0	45.5
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	73.7	12.3	7.0	3.5	3.5	57.9	12.3	8.8	8.8	12.3
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	76.6	10.6	10.6	0.0	2.1	44.7	8.5	14.9	4.3	27.7
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	73.1	7.7	11.5	0.0	7.7	57.7	3.8	7.7	3.8	26.9
Carter (N=55;M;S)	76.4	9.1	3.6	1.8	9.1	45.5	10.9	9.1	5.5	29.1
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	74.4	12.8	2.6	2.6	7.7	41.0	7.7	5.1	2.6	43.6
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	60.0	16.0	20.0	0.0	4.0	56.0	24.0	4.0	4.0	12.0
TOTAL	70.4	11.9	8.3	2.0	7.4	46.6	17.6	10.3	4.2	21.3

TABLE 5-23 (Continued)

	Source and proportion of support									
	FAMILY--ROOM & BOARD					FAMILY--OTHER THAN ROOM & BOARD				
Institution by socioeconomic level	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	75.9	9.3	1.9	1.9	11.1	83.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	5.6
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	72.9	18.8	4.2	2.1	2.1	64.6	8.3	12.5	2.1	12.5
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	93.9	1.5	3.0	0.0	1.5	97.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	75.0	4.2	16.7	2.1	2.1	75.0	6.3	14.6	2.1	2.1
Newson (N=63;W;R)	60.3	19.0	12.7	3.2	4.8	63.5	17.5	7.9	6.3	4.8
Walden (N=48;W;U-S)	58.3	22.9	8.3	2.1	8.3	81.6	8.2	6.1	2.0	2.0
Appleton (N=39;M;U-S)	71.8	5.1	12.8	2.6	7.7	76.9	7.7	5.1	0.0	10.3
Foster (N=39;M;U)	87.2	5.1	2.6	0.0	5.1	89.7	7.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
Langston (N=35;M;U-S)	80.0	0.0	5.7	2.9	11.4	97.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	70.2	17.5	10.5	1.8	0.0	71.9	12.3	8.8	0.0	7.0
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	78.7	4.3	8.5	0.0	8.5	87.2	6.4	4.3	0.0	2.1
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	80.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	15.4	88.5	0.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Carter (N=55;M;S)	67.3	0.0	18.2	3.6	10.9	87.3	3.6	9.1	0.0	0.0
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	79.5	7.7	5.1	0.0	7.7	92.3	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.0
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	60.0	24.0	12.0	0.0	4.0	56.0	20.0	12.0	4.0	8.0
TOTAL	74.2	9.4	8.6	1.6	6.2	80.9	7.1	6.2	1.7	4.1

TABLE 5-23 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Source and proportion of support									
	SPOUSE					SCHOLARSHIP				
	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	94.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	91.7	2.1	0.0	2.1	4.2	89.6	4.2	4.2	0.0	2.1
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	97.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	89.6	0.0	2.1	0.0	8.3	95.8	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0
Newson (N=63;W;R)	92.1	1.6	4.8	0.0	1.6	87.3	6.3	3.2	0.0	3.2
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	85.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	10.0	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foster (N=39;M;U)	87.2	2.6	2.6	2.6	5.1	97.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Langston (N=34;M;U-S)	97.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	87.7	1.8	3.5	1.8	5.3	91.2	1.8	0.0	1.8	5.3
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	80.9	0.0	8.5	2.1	8.5	97.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
Carter (N=54;M;S)	88.9	3.7	1.9	0.0	5.6	96.4	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	92.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	80.0	4.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	91.0	1.3	2.6	1.0	4.1	96.1	1.7	.7	.3	1.2

TABLE 5-23 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Source and proportion of support									
	LOANS					G.I. BILL				
	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	92.6	1.9	5.6	0.0	0.0	81.5	1.9	9.3	1.9	5.6
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	91.7	6.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	89.6	2.1	4.2	0.0	4.2
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.7
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	97.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	79.2	4.2	6.3	0.0	10.4
Newson (N=63;W;R)	88.9	6.3	1.6	1.6	1.6	90.5	0.0	3.2	1.6	4.8
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.6	6.1	6.1	0.0	8.2
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	7.5	2.5	2.5	0.0
Foster (N=39;M;U)	84.6	2.6	2.6	0.0	10.3	71.8	2.6	7.7	2.6	15.4
Langston (N=35;M;U-S)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	8.6
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	93.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	3.5	80.7	1.8	8.8	0.0	8.8
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	91.5	4.3	2.1	2.1	0.0	78.7	2.1	6.4	2.1	10.6
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.6	0.0	3.8	0.0	11.5
Carter (N=55;M;S)	96.4	1.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	83.6	5.5	1.8	0.0	9.1
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.5	0.0	5.1	0.0	15.4
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	88.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	76.0	4.0	4.0	8.0	8.0
TOTAL	94.8	2.0	1.4	.7	1.0	82.1	2.6	4.6	1.0	9.7

TABLE 5-23 (Continued)

	Source and proportion of support									
	OTHER GOVERNMENT BENEFITS					OTHER SOURCES				
Institution by socioeconomic level	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
High										
Meade (N=54;W;S)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.7	0.0	3.7	1.9	3.7
Quanto (N=48;W;U-S)	97.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.1	0.0	6.1	9.1	28.8
Middle										
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	95.8	2.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	87.5	2.1	2.1	0.0	8.3
Newson (N=63;W;R)	84.1	4.8	4.8	1.6	4.8	98.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	93.9	2.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	85.0	7.5	5.0	0.0	2.5	97.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
Foster (N=39,M;U)	94.9	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	89.7	0.0	2.6	2.6	5.1
Langston (N=35;M;U-S)	97.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	89.5	1.8	0.0	1.8	7.0	98.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0
Sherwood (N=47;M;R)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Low										
Manning (N=26;B;U)	92.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	92.3	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0
Carter (N=55;M;S)	98.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lowell (N=39;M;U)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Palmerston (N=25;M;R)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
TOTAL	95.1	1.4	1.2	.6	1.7	91.9	.6	1.6	1.3	4.6

TABLE 5-24

THE EXTENT STUDENTS REPORTED FINANCES TO BE A PROBLEM TO THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Not a problem	Minor problem	Difficult problem	Serious problem
High				
Meade (N=84;W;S)	36.9	34.5	16.7	11.9
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	40.8	34.2	19.7	5.3
Ward (N=87;W;U-S)	55.2	28.7	13.8	2.3
Middle				
Kinsey (N=72;W;R)	31.9	41.7	19.4	6.9
Newson (N=91;W;R)	38.5	30.8	26.4	4.4
Walden (N=77;W;U-S)	40.3	31.2	20.8	7.8
Appleton (N=60;M;U-S)	55.0	16.7	23.3	5.0
Foster (N=56;M;U)	25.0	41.1	23.2	10.7
Langston (N=60;M;U-S)	35.0	20.0	25.0	20.0
Shaw (N=73;M;U)	37.0	32.9	20.5	9.6
Sherwood (N=64;M;R)	45.3	25.0	20.3	9.4
Low				
Manning (N=38;B;U)	31.6	28.9	15.8	23.7
Carter (N=81;M;S)	50.6	29.6	14.8	4.9
Lowell (N=62;M;U)	40.3	30.6	21.0	8.1
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	36.2	50.0	10.3	3.4
TOTAL	40.6	31.8	19.4	8.2

TABLE 5-25

STUDENTS' RESPONSE AS TO WHETHER OR NOT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE WAS AVAILABLE TO THEM
(in Percent*)

Institution by socioeconomic level	No	Yes	Unsure
High			
Meade (N=52;W;S)	1.9	63.5	34.6
Quanto (N=46;W;U-S)	10.9	65.2	23.9
Ward (N=39;W;U-S)	2.6	61.5	35.9
Middle			
Kinsey (N=52;W;R)	3.8	53.8	42.3
Newson (N=67;W;R)	0.0	74.6	25.4
Walden (N=42;W;U-S)	2.4	54.8	42.9
Appleton (N=48;M;U-S)	0.0	77.1	22.9
Foster (N=37;M;U)	2.7	64.9	32.4
Langston (N=33;M;U-S)	6.1	81.8	12.1
Shaw (N=42;M;U)	0.0	71.4	28.6
Sherwood (N=44;M;R)	2.3	63.6	34.1
Low			
Manning (N=30;B;U)	10.0	40.0	50.0
Carter (N=39;M;S)	5.1	46.2	48.7
Lowell (N=24;M;U)	12.5	79.2	8.3
Palmerston (N=50;M;R)	2.0	80.0	18.0
TOTAL	3.6	65.6	30.9

*Thirty-nine percent of the base sample did not respond to this item.

TABLE 5-26

STUDENTS' CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Currently employed	Won't work during school	Looking for part-time job	Looking for full-time job	No plans yet
High					
Meade (N=250;W;S)	70.4	8.8	14.0	2.4	4.4
Quanto (N=231;W;U-S)	67.5	10.4	14.7	1.7	5.6
Ward (N=226;W;U-S)	90.3	2.7	1.3	4.0	1.8
Middle					
Kinsey (N=207;W;R)	69.6	9.7	9.7	5.3	5.8
Newson (N=265;W;R)	59.6	15.8	17.4	1.9	5.3
Walden (N=227;W;U-S)	71.8	7.5	11.9	4.8	4.0
Appleton (N=171;M;U-S)	58.5	11.1	15.8	7.0	7.6
Foster (N=164;M;U)	72.6	11.0	9.8	1.8	4.9
Langston (N=161;M;U-S)	60.9	5.0	21.7	9.3	3.1
Shaw (N=232;M;U)	63.8	11.2	13.8	4.3	6.9
Sherwood (N=186;M;R)	60.2	18.3	12.9	2.7	5.9
Low					
Manning (N=120;B;U)	54.2	10.8	22.5	10.0	2.5
Carter (N=234;M;S)	71.8	8.5	11.1	3.8	4.7
Lowell (N=190;M;U)	72.6	4.2	12.1	7.9	3.2
Palmerston (N=192;M;R)	49.0	12.5	28.6	4.2	5.7
TOTAL	66.9	9.8	14.1	4.4	4.8

TABLE 5-27

STUDENTS' OPINIONS OF THE EFFECT OF WORK ON THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Take fewer classes	Drop a class	Take longer to graduate	May withdraw temporarily	May not finish school	Less time to study	Lower grade in class	Fail a class	No effect
High									
Meade (N=81;W;S)	34.6	7.4	29.6	3.7	2.5	29.6	8.6	0.0	21.3
Quanto (N=72;W;U-S)	4.2	2.8	4.2	0.0	2.8	31.9	9.7	5.6	29.2
Ward (N=86;W;U-S)	38.4	7.0	59.3	2.3	2.3	40.7	12.8	1.2	17.4
Middle									
Kinsey (N=75;W;R)	38.7	9.3	32.0	6.7	1.3	42.7	16.0	4.0	9.3
Newson (N=89;W;R)	2.2	4.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	27.0	11.2	0.0	28.1
Walden (N=77;W;U-S)	23.4	15.6	27.3	3.9	7.8	37.7	11.7	2.6	19.5
Appleton (N=60;M;U-S)	26.7	6.7	21.7	6.7	1.7	18.3	6.7	0.0	18.3
Foster (N=56;M;U)	41.1	12.5	42.9	7.1	7.1	44.6	21.4	1.8	12.5
Langston (N=57;M;U-S)	35.1	17.5	31.6	15.8	5.3	36.8	10.5	3.5	14.0
Shaw (N=73;M;U)	41.1	9.6	32.9	6.8	1.4	32.9	13.7	9.6	15.1
Sherwood (N=65;M;R)	29.2	9.2	26.2	3.1	1.5	32.3	7.7	3.1	13.8
Low									
Manning (N=38;B;U)	23.7	7.9	21.1	10.5	5.3	31.6	5.3	2.6	5.3
Carter (N=77;M;S)	32.5	13.0	29.9	6.5	5.2	27.3	13.0	2.6	15.8
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	13.3	13.3	21.7	5.0	3.3	36.7	11.7	3.3	28.3
Palmerston (N=60;M;R)	1.7	1.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	3.3	26.7
TOTAL	25.7	9.1	25.8	4.9	3.0	32.4	10.9	2.8	18.8

TABLE 5-28

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS PLANNING TO MAKE CAREERS OF THEIR CURRENT OCCUPATIONS*

Institution by socioeconomic level	Percent
High	
Meade (N=38;W;S)	39.3
Quanto (N=45;W;U-S)	34.0
Ward (N=28;W;U-S)	63.6
Middle	
Kinsey (N=41;W;R)	16.7
Newson (N=54;W;R)	27.8
Walden (N=38;W;U-S)	28.8
Appleton (N=25;M;U-S)	41.9
Foster (N=23;M;U)	36.8
Langston (N=27;M;U-S)	50.0
Shaw (N=26;M;U)	54.3
Sherwood (N=36;M;R)	31.6
Low	
Manning (N=19;B;U)	25.0
Carter (N=30;M;S)	51.1
Lowell (N=27;M;U)	59.6
Palmerston (N=30;M;R)	25.0
TOTAL	41.2

*The figures in this table are based on the 60 percent of the sample that responded to the item.

TABLE 5-29

STUDENTS' ANTICIPATED OCCUPATIONS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	General worker	Semi-skilled worker	Skilled clerical or sales	Skilled craftsman or forman	Protective service worker	Owner or manager-small business
High						
Meade (N=215;W;S)	5.6	5.1	15.3	2.3	5.1	5.1
Quanto (N=201;W;U-S)	7.5	6.0	10.4	3.5	3.5	5.0
Ward (N=202;W;U-S)	2.5	5.4	6.4	6.4	2.0	5.9
Middle						
Kinsey (N=174;W;R)	8.0	7.5	8.6	3.4	2.3	5.7
Newson (N=224;W;R)	8.0	4.5	11.6	2.7	2.2	6.3
Walden (N=184;W;U-S)	4.9	11.4	13.6	3.3	1.6	4.9
Appleton (N=142;M;U-S)	1.4	3.5	11.3	7.0	4.2	2.8
Foster (N=145;M;U)	2.8	9.0	11.0	4.1	6.2	2.1
Langston (N=131;M;U-S)	3.1	8.4	11.5	16.0	1.5	7.6
Shaw (N=193;M;U)	2.6	3.6	8.3	2.1	5.7	6.2
Sherwood (N=150;M;R)	2.0	5.3	5.3	1.3	4.0	2.7
Low						
Manning (N=99;B;U)	5.1	6.1	9.1	4.0	3.0	2.0
Carter (N=207;M;S)	2.4	7.7	7.2	7.2	12.1	3.9
Lowell (N=165;M;U)	5.5	11.5	7.3	20.6	0.6	10.3
Palmerston (N=165;M;R)	6.1	4.2	18.2	7.3	6.7	3.6
TOTAL	4.6	6.5	10.4	5.8	4.2	5.1

TABLE 5-29 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Farm owner or manager	Semi-professional or technician	Managerial/professional I	Managerial/professional II	Housewife	Unemployed
High						
Meade (N=215;W;S)	0.5	8.4	33.5	8.8	3.7	6.5
Quanto (N=201;W;U-S)	0.0	15.9	36.8	8.0	0.0	3.5
Ward (N=202;W;U-S)	0.5	19.3	44.6	3.0	0.0	4.0
Middle						
Kinsey (N=174;W;R)	0.6	14.4	28.2	12.6	0.6	8.0
Newson (N=224;W;R)	3.1	7.6	35.7	8.9	1.8	7.6
Walden (N=184;W;U-S)	0.0	11.4	32.6	7.1	0.0	9.2
Appleton (N=142;M;U-S)	0.7	14.8	33.1	11.3	2.1	7.7
Foster (N=145;M;U)	0.0	12.4	33.1	11.7	0.7	6.9
Langston (N=131;M;U-S)	0.0	7.6	29.0	10.7	0.8	3.8
Shaw (N=193;M;U)	0.5	15.5	35.2	13.0	1.0	6.2
Sherwood (N=150;M;R)	0.0	11.3	44.0	10.7	4.0	9.3
Low						
Manning (N=99;B;U)	0.0	12.1	33.3	18.2	0.0	7.1
Carter (N=207;M;S)	0.5	8.2	29.0	9.7	1.0	11.1
Lowell (N=165;M;U)	0.0	15.2	19.4	2.4	2.4	4.8
Palmerston (N=165;M;R)	4.2	21.8	16.4	1.8	1.8	7.9
TOTAL	0.8	13.0	32.5	8.8	1.3	6.9

TABLE 5-30

EXTENT OF STUDENTS' AGREEMENT THAT THEIR TEACHERS POSSESS VARIOUS QUALITIES (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are well prepared				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	32.9	50.0	15.9	1.2	0.0
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	42.9	37.7	15.6	3.9	0.0
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	39.4	53.0	4.5	3.0	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	44.1	42.6	11.8	1.5	0.0
Newson (N=90;W;R)	33.3	52.2	10.0	4.4	0.0
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	27.1	55.7	14.3	2.9	0.0
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	41.8	38.2	12.7	5.5	1.8
Foster (N=46;M;U)	28.3	52.2	10.9	6.5	2.2
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	43.8	45.8	4.2	6.3	0.0
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	45.6	41.8	10.1	2.5	0.0
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	39.6	50.9	9.4	0.0	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=40;B;U)	52.5	35.0	7.5	5.0	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	40.5	48.6	6.8	4.1	0.0
Lowell (N=59;M;U)	33.9	49.2	10.2	3.4	3.4
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	50.0	32.8	10.3	5.2	1.7
TOTAL	39.3	46.1	10.6	3.5	0.5

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers use clarifying examples				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	29.3	51.2	13.4	6.1	0.0
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	29.9	44.2	18.2	7.8	0.0
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	27.3	57.6	9.1	6.1	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	32.4	41.2	14.7	8.8	2.9
Newson (N=90;W;R)	22.2	48.9	20.0	8.9	0.0
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	21.7	52.2	18.8	7.2	0.0
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	37.0	44.4	11.1	5.6	1.9
Foster (N=46;M;U)	32.6	54.3	6.5	4.3	2.2
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	41.7	41.7	10.4	6.3	0.0
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	31.6	44.3	17.7	3.8	2.5
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	32.1	52.8	11.3	3.8	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	46.3	34.1	12.2	7.3	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	27.0	54.1	16.2	2.7	0.0
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	36.7	50.0	8.3	3.3	1.7
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	44.8	39.7	6.9	1.7	6.9
TOTAL	31.7	47.8	13.7	5.7	1.1

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are interested in teaching				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	34.1	53.7	9.8	1.2	1.2
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	40.8	43.4	11.8	3.9	0.0
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	36.4	47.0	13.6	3.0	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	45.6	45.6	7.4	1.5	0.0
Newson (N=90;W;R)	33.3	50.0	11.1	4.4	1.1
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	34.8	52.2	10.1	2.9	0.0
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	38.9	50.0	9.3	0.0	1.9
Foster (N=46;M;U)	34.8	47.8	15.2	2.2	0.0
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	59.6	29.8	6.4	4.3	0.0
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	30.4	53.2	11.4	5.1	0.0
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	45.3	43.4	9.4	0.0	1.9
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	56.1	36.6	7.3	0.0	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	39.2	45.9	12.2	0.0	2.7
Lowell (N=61;M;U)	34.4	49.2	6.6	6.6	3.3
Palmerston (N=57;M;R)	54.4	31.6	7.0	3.5	3.5
TOTAL	40.0	46.2	10.1	2.7	1.0

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are interested in students				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=81;W;S)	32.1	43.2	18.5	4.9	1.2
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	41.6	33.8	20.8	1.3	2.6
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	29.2	43.1	26.2	1.5	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=67;W;R)	41.8	41.8	11.9	4.5	0.0
Newson (N=89;W;R)	30.3	50.6	12.4	5.6	1.1
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	24.3	54,3	14.3	5.7	1.4
Appleton (N=53;W;U-S)	39.6	41.5	11.3	5.7	1.9
Foster (N=46;M;U)	30.4	43.5	19.6	4.3	2.2
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	59.6	21.3	14.9	4.3	0.0
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	25.3	43.0	22.8	6.3	2.5
Sherwood (N=52;M;R)	53.8	34.6	9.6	0.0	1.9
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	53.7	19.5	24.4	2.4	0.0
Carter (N=75;M;S)	30.7	54.7	10.7	4.0	0.0
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	35.0	43.3	11.7	6.7	3.3
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	51.7	25.9	17.2	1.7	3.4
TOTAL	37.1	41.0	16.4	4.1	1.5

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers hold students' attention				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	13.4	43.9	25.6	11.0	6.1
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	22.1	36.4	29.9	11.7	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	16.9	53.8	20.0	9.2	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	22.1	58.8	10.3	7.4	1.5
Newson (N=90;W;R)	11.1	44.4	23.3	16.7	4.4
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	11.4	54.3	21.4	11.4	1.4
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	30.9	40.0	12.7	12.7	3.6
Foster (N=46;M;U)	21.7	41.3	23.9	8.7	4.3
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	44.7	34.0	17.0	4.3	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	19.2	46.2	23.1	9.0	2.6
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	28.3	49.1	15.1	7.5	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	39.0	41.5	7.3	12.2	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	13.5	54.1	25.7	5.4	1.4
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	28.3	45.0	15.0	10.0	1.7
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	41.4	34.5	15.5	5.2	3.4
TOTAL	22.5	45.6	19.9	9.8	2.2

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Courses are well organized				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82:W;S)	19.5	45.1	24.4	9.8	1.2
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	16.9	46.8	29.9	5.2	1.3
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	16.9	58.5	21.5	3.1	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	27.9	48.5	17.6	4.4	1.5
Newson (N=90;W;R)	16.7	50.0	23.3	8.9	1.1
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	14.3	45.7	32.9	5.7	1.4
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	25.5	34.5	25.5	12.7	1.8
Foster (N=45;M;U)	22.2	42.2	24.4	6.7	4.4
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	37.5	35.4	16.7	8.3	2.1
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	29.1	45.6	19.0	6.3	0.0
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	22.6	54.7	18.9	3.8	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	36.6	36.6	17.1	9.8	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	18.9	59.5	13.5	6.8	1.4
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	23.3	45.0	18.3	6.7	6.7
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	43.1	36.2	10.3	8.6	1.7
TOTAL	23.7	46.4	21.2	7.0	1.6

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers grade fairly				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=81;W;S)	21.0	51.9	22.2	3.7	1.2
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	27.6	39.5	25.0	7.9	0.0
Ward (N=66;W;U-S)	30.3	50.0	19.7	0.0	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=67;W;R)	26.9	53.7	19.4	0.0	0.0
Newson (N=90;W;R)	16.7	43.3	22.2	13.3	4.4
Walden (N=67;W;U-S)	9.0	55.2	32.8	1.5	1.5
Appleton (N=78;M;U-S)	30.9	43.6	12.7	7.3	5.5
Foster (N=43;M;U)	32.6	46.5	11.6	7.0	2.3
Langston (N=46;M;U-S)	34.8	45.7	15.2	4.3	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	28.2	48.7	17.9	3.8	1.3
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	35.8	52.8	9.4	0.0	1.9
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	43.9	29.3	12.2	14.6	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	17.6	56.8	23.0	1.4	1.4
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	31.7	45.0	21.7	1.7	0.0
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	37.9	39.7	12.1	5.2	5.2
TOTAL	26.9	47.3	19.4	4.7	1.7

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers encourage students' opinions				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	26.8	51.2	18.3	3.7	0.0
Quanto (N=67;W;U-S)	31.6	44.7	15.8	5.3	2.6
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	26.2	47.7	23.1	3.1	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	35.3	47.1	13.2	1.5	2.9
Newson (N=90;W;R)	22.2	54.4	17.8	3.3	2.2
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	18.8	59.4	14.5	5.8	1.4
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	31.5	53.7	11.1	0.0	3.7
Foster (N=44;M;U)	36.4	50.0	13.6	0.0	0.0
Langston (N=46;M;U-S)	52.2	32.6	13.0	0.0	2.2
Shaw (N=77;M;U)	27.3	48.1	19.5	5.2	0.0
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	60.4	32.1	7.5	0.0	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=40;B;U)	57.5	37.5	2.5	0.0	2.5
Carter (N=75;M;S)	41.3	41.3	12.0	4.0	1.3
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	28.3	46.7	20.0	5.0	0.0
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	46.6	36.2	8.6	5.2	3.4
TOTAL	34.3	46.4	14.7	3.1	1.5

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are intellectually stimulating				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	19.5	42.7	24.4	11.0	2.4
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	23.4	39.0	26.0	10.4	1.3
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	23.1	36.9	29.2	9.2	1.5
Middle					
Kinsey (N=67;W;R)	37.3	46.3	10.4	1.5	4.5
Newson (N=90;W;R)	17.8	41.1	25.6	11.1	4.4
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	15.7	44.3	22.9	17.1	0.0
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	31.5	40.7	20.4	3.7	3.7
Foster (N=46;M;U)	28.3	47.8	15.2	4.3	4.3
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	44.7	38.3	12.8	4.3	0.0
Shaw (N=77;M;U)	24.7	42.9	23.4	5.2	3.9
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	43.4	39.6	17.0	0.0	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=40;B;U)	52.5	35.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
Carter (N=75;M;S)	28.0	40.0	29.3	2.7	0.0
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	36.7	40.0	15.0	6.7	1.7
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	37.9	36.2	15.5	3.4	6.9
TOTAL	29.1	40.9	20.9	6.7	2.4

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers make assignments clear				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	19.5	57.3	22.0	1.2	0.0
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	20.8	54.5	18.2	6.5	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	26.2	49.2	18.5	6.2	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	26.5	57.4	11.8	1.5	2.9
Newson (N=90;W;R)	20.0	56.7	16.7	6.7	0.0
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	17.6	60.3	13.2	7.4	1.5
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	29.1	54.5	9.1	7.3	0.0
Foster (N=45;M;U)	28.9	55.6	15.6	0.0	0.0
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	40.4	38.3	14.9	6.4	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	24.4	60.3	10.3	2.6	2.6
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	32.1	58.5	9.4	0.0	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	51.2	34.1	14.6	0.0	0.0
Carter (N=75;M;S)	18.7	52.0	21.3	6.7	1.3
Lowell (N=47;M;U)	35.0	43.3	16.7	5.0	0.0
Palmerston (N=57;M;R)	43.9	35.1	17.5	3.5	0.0
TOTAL	27.3	52.2	15.6	4.3	0.6

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are familiar with their subject				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	36.6	45.1	15.9	2.4	0.0
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	36.4	48.1	14.3	1.3	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	40.0	44.6	12.3	1.5	1.5
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	44.1	45.6	8.8	1.5	0.0
Newson (N=90;W;R)	37.8	50.0	8.9	3.3	0.0
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	33.3	49.3	15.9	1.4	0.0
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	41.8	50.9	3.6	1.8	1.8
Foster (N=46;M;U)	41.3	45.7	6.5	4.3	2.2
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	51.1	38.3	8.5	2.1	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	35.9	51.3	10.3	1.3	1.3
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	32.1	50.9	15.1	1.9	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	51.2	39.0	7.3	2.4	0.0
Carter (N=74;M;S)	39.2	48.6	10.8	0.0	1.4
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	53.3	33.3	8.3	1.7	3.3
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	56.9	24.1	13.8	3.4	1.7
TOTAL	41.2	45.0	11.0	2.0	0.8

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers give a reasonable amount of work				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=81;W;S)	19.8	56.8	17.3	6.2	0.0
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	28.6	57.1	13.0	1.3	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	30.8	60.0	7.7	1.5	0.0
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	22.1	58.8	11.8	4.4	2.9
Newson (N=90;W;R)	15.6	63.3	12.2	7.8	1.1
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	20.3	63.8	13.0	2.9	0.0
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	27.3	50.9	16.4	3.6	1.8
Foster (N=46;M;U)	23.9	54.3	17.4	4.3	0.0
Langston (N=46;M;U-S)	45.7	45.7	8.7	0.0	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	21.8	60.3	16.7	1.3	0.0
Sherwood (N=52;M;R)	32.7	59.6	3.8	3.8	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	36.6	36.6	17.1	7.3	2.4
Carter (N=74;M;S)	18.9	68.9	9.5	2.7	0.0
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	31.7	51.7	10.0	5.0	1.7
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	39.7	44.8	12.1	1.7	1.7
TOTAL	26.4	56.8	12.5	3.6	0.7

TABLE 5-30 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Teachers are easy to talk to outside of class				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	28.0	43.9	18.3	6.1	3.7
Quanto (N=77;W;U-S)	39.0	42.9	16.9	1.3	0.0
Ward (N=65;W;U-S)	32.3	40.0	23.1	3.1	1.5
Middle					
Kinsey (N=68;W;R)	44.1	35.3	16.2	2.9	1.5
Newson (N=89;W;R)	27.0	47.2	14.6	7.9	3.4
Walden (N=69;W;U-S)	29.0	47.8	15.9	2.9	4.3
Appleton (N=55;M;U-S)	36.4	32.7	23.6	5.5	1.8
Foster (N=46;M;U)	45.7	23.9	26.1	2.2	2.2
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	46.8	34.0	17.0	2.1	0.0
Shaw (N=78;M;U)	24.4	43.6	29.5	2.6	0.0
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	41.5	41.5	15.1	1.9	0.0
Low					
Manning (N=40;B;U)	50.0	25.0	15.0	10.0	0.0
Carter (N=75;M;S)	29.3	44.0	18.7	5.3	2.7
Lowell (N=60;M;U)	35.0	41.7	20.0	3.3	0.0
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	50.0	37.9	5.2	5.2	1.7
TOTAL	35.8	40.0	18.4	4.2	1.7

TABLE 5-31

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF THEIR INSTRUCTORS OUTSIDE OF CLASS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Readily available	Generally available	Generally unavailable	Never available	Never tried to see instructor
High					
Meade (N=82;W;S)	45.1	41.5	2.4	2.4	8.5
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	64.5	32.9	1.3	0.0	1.3
Ward (N=64;W;U-S)	32.8	35.9	1.6	0.0	29.7
Middle					
Kinsey (N=67;W;R)	49.3	46.3	1.5	1.5	1.5
Newson (N=90;W;R)	46.7	47.8	1.1	0.0	4.4
Walden (N=71;W;U-S)	49.3	38.0	2.8	1.4	8.5
Appleton (N=54;M;U-S)	35.2	37.0	9.3	1.9	16.7
Foster (N=45;M;U)	46.7	37.8	2.2	2.2	11.1
Langston (N=47;M;U-S)	55.3	29.8	2.1	2.1	10.6
Shaw (N=79;M;U)	53.2	34.1	3.8	1.3	7.6
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	64.2	26.4	0.0	3.8	5.7
Low					
Manning (N=41;B;U)	46.3	34.1	7.3	0.0	12.2
Carter (N=74;M;S)	51.4	28.4	2.7	1.4	16.2
Lowell (N=59;M;U)	37.3	32.2	3.4	1.7	25.4
Palmerston (N=60;M;R)	61.7	25.0	1.7	5.0	6.7
TOTAL	49.4	35.8	2.7	1.6	10.6

TABLE 5-32

COMPOSITE OF PROBLEMS WITH WHICH STUDENTS NEEDED, SOUGHT, AND RECEIVED HELP (in Percent)

	TEST SCORES			GRADE IMPROVEMENT		
Institution by socioeconomic level	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=68;W;S)	33.8	22.4	19.3	33.3	18.2	14.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	36.4	28.8	29.6	39.4	27.1	18.5
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	23.5	22.5	24.4	31.4	15.0	17.1
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	22.8	12.7	13.0	31.6	16.4	15.2
Newson (N=80;W;R)	32.5	25.9	20.0	36.6	15.9	11.4
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	36.1	24.1	18.8	34.4	17.2	12.5
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	25.0	7.1	4.5	32.5	3.6	0.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	30.6	18.2	14.3	27.8	18.2	3.6
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	35.0	26.5	33.3	35.0	20.6	0.0
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	27.4	26.4	23.5	29.0	17.0	9.8
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	27.5	23.5	21.1	20.0	14.7	18.4
Low						
Manning (N=39;B;R)	51.3	34.5	26.1	37.8	20.7	13.0
Carter (N=68;M;S)	16.2	9.8	9.3	26.5	6.6	5.6
Lowell (N=42;M;R)	33.3	18.8	6.9	43.9	21.9	13.8
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	51.0	51.2	35.9	55.1	26.8	23.1
TOTAL	31.7	23.4	20.3	34.3	17.3	12.4

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	CHANGING MAJOR			CHANGING OCCUPATION PLANS		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=68;W;S)	40.3	29.9	24.6	22.1	13.6	14.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	28.8	27.1	25.9	18.2	11.9	7.4
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	29.4	30.0	29.3	11.8	10.0	9.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	36.8	32.7	26.1	26.3	18.2	10.9
Newson (N=80;W;R)	37.5	32.1	25.7	27.5	24.7	11.4
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	37.7	32.8	25.0	32.8	25.9	25.0
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	27.5	25.0	18.2	22.5	17.9	9.1
Foster (N=36;M;U)	30.6	24.2	21.4	33.3	21.2	21.4
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	40.0	29.4	22.2	27.5	20.6	7.4
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	21.0	13.2	19.6	16.1	3.8	3.9
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	27.5	29.4	23.7	22.5	20.6	26.3
Low						
Manning (N=39;B;R)	34.2	37.9	30.4	21.6	10.3	17.4
Carter (N=68;M;S)	36.8	37.7	33.3	25.0	19.7	11.1
Lowell (N=42;M;U)	33.3	26.5	20.7	24.4	21.9	20.7
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	28.6	31.7	20.5	22.4	26.8	20.5
TOTAL	33.0	29.6	24.9	23.5	17.9	13.9

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

	IMPROVEMENT OF STUDY HABITS			STAYING IN SCHOOL		
Institution by socioeconomic level	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=68;W;S)	18.2	6.1	5.3	13.6	7.6	7.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	24.2	6.8	3.7	21.2	15.3	14.8
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	27.5	7.5	7.3	9.8	12.5	14.6
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	28.1	16.4	15.2	12.3	5.5	6.5
Newson (N=80;W;R)	30.0	6.2	5.7	12.5	9.9	7.1
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	39.3	15.5	12.5	27.9	19.0	18.8
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	45.0	14.3	13.6	22.5	10.7	4.5
Foster (N=36;M;U)	38.9	18.2	3.6	19.4	21.2	14.3
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	37.5	17.6	7.4	22.5	14.7	7.4
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	25.8	13.2	9.8	8.1	7.5	2.0
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	22.5	11.8	10.5	12.5	17.6	15.8
Low						
Manning (N=39;B;U)	36.8	27.6	17.4	21.6	10.0	8.7
Carter (N=68;M;S)	27.9	9.8	9.3	11.8	6.6	3.7
Lowell (N=42;M;R)	41.5	9.4	10.3	33.3	18.8	6.9
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	46.9	22.0	12.8	22.4	22.0	12.8
TOTAL	31.6	12.4	9.1	17.4	12.5	9.6

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	GETTING OFF ACADEMIC PROBATION			SELECTING CLASSES		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=57;W;S)	10.4	7.6	5.3	73.9	70.1	63.2
Quanto (N=54;W;U-S)	13.6	13.6	5.6	50.0	42.4	31.5
Ward (N=41;W;U-S)	3.9	5.0	2.4	54.9	57.5	58.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=46;W;R)	3.5	1.8	0.0	86.0	74.5	69.6
Newson (N=70;W;R)	6.3	4.9	4.3	67.9	63.9	54.9
Walden (N=48;W;U-S)	16.4	8.6	6.3	68.9	67.2	47.9
Appleton (N=22;M;U-S)	7.5	0.0	0.0	55.0	57.1	40.9
Foster (N=28;M;U)	8.3	6.1	3.6	61.1	54.5	46.4
Langston (N=27;M;U-S)	12.5	14.7	0.0	65.0	64.7	37.0
Shaw (N=51;M;U)	6.5	3.8	2.0	61.3	64.2	60.8
Sherwood (N=38;M;R)	7.5	2.9	5.3	60.3	67.6	60.5
Low						
Manning (N=23;B;U)	2.7	6.9	0.0	71.8	61.3	69.6
Carter (N=43;M;S)	5.9	4.9	5.6	67.6	67.2	64.8
Lowell (N=29;M;U)	19.5	12.5	3.4	63.6	54.3	51.7
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	10.2	7.3	5.1	53.1	46.3	41.0
TOTAL	8.9	6.7	3.7	64.5	61.7	54.0

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	SELECTING INSTRUCTORS			SELECTING TRANSFER COLLEGE		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=57;W;S)	20.9	11.[illegible]	8.8	35.3	25.8	15.8
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	33.3	15.3	9.3	25.8	23.7	18.5
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	13.7	7.5	7.3	11.8	12.5	12.2
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	35.1	20.0	15.2	22.8	21.8	15.2
Newson (N=80;W;R)	17.5	12.3	7.0	26.8	22.0	14.1
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	37.7	13.8	8.3	36.1	20.7	10.4
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	32.5	17.9	13.6	37.5	32.1	22.7
Foster (N=36;M;U)	30.6	30.3	28.6	19.4	27.3	10.7
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	32.5	5.9	3.7	40.0	32.4	33.3
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	35.5	18.9	13.7	14.5	13.2	7.8
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	40.0	35.3	31.6	15.0	11.8	18.4
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	24.3	17.2	8.7	35.1	13.8	13.0
Carter (N=68;M;S)	29.4	9.8	11.1	33.8	23.0	16.7
Lowell (N=41;M;U)	34.1	12.1	6.9	22.0	12.1	10.3
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	30.6	26.8	15.4	18.4	22.0	20.5
TOTAL	29.3	16.1	12.1	26.4	21.1	15.4

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

	FUTURE EDUCATION PLANS			PERSONAL OR SOCIAL PROBLEMS		
Institution by socioeconomic level	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=67;W;S)	41.2	31.8	24.6	19.7	10.6	8.8
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	39.4	37.3	25.9	34.8	23.7	20.4
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	33.3	27.5	26.8	11.8	12.5	9.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	40.4	32.7	23.9	14.0	7.3	6.5
Newson (N=80;W;R)	41.0	31.3	29.6	27.5	7.4	8.5
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	39.3	29.3	16.7	16.4	10.3	8.3
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	47.5	35.7	27.3	30.0	7.1	13.6
Foster (N=36;M;U)	61.1	51.5	25.0	22.2	9.1	7.1
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	52.5	50.0	29.6	17.5	11.8	7.4
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	24.2	22.6	17.6	14.5	5.7	3.9
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	32.5	26.5	26.3	15.0	11.8	10.5
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	39.5	31.0	17.4	31.6	20.7	8.7
Carter (N=68;M;S)	29.4	21.3	20.4	14.7	4.9	5.6
Lowell (N=41;M;U)	43.9	34.4	20.7	22.5	3.1	0.0
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	30.6	34.1	25.6	22.4	24.4	20.5
TOTAL	38.8	32.2	23.9	20.9	11.1	9.4

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	PROBLEMS WITH FAMILY			SELF UNDERSTANDING		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=65;W;S)	15.4	7.6	8.8	20.0	6.1	5.3
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	16.7	10.2	9.3	26.2	15.3	15.1
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	5.9	5.0	7.3	13.7	5.0	7.3
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	5.3	1.8	0.0	12.3	5.5	6.5
Newson (N=80;W;U-S)	8.8	2.5	1.4	22.2	4.9	2.8
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	8.2	6.9	4.2	16.4	8.6	6.3
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	17.5	0.0	4.5	25.0	7.1	9.1
Foster (N=36;M;U)	13.9	3.0	0.0	27.8	9.1	7.1
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	12.5	0.0	3.7	20.0	2.9	7.4
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	6.5	1.9	2.0	21.0	5.7	5.9
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	15.0	0.0	5.3	22.5	17.6	23.7
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	21.6	3.4	0.0	21.1	6.9	13.0
Carter (N=68;M;S)	8.8	3.3	1.9	11.8	3.3	3.7
Lowell (N=40;M;U)	20.0	3.1	0.0	31.7	6.3	0.0
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	16.3	4.9	5.1	22.4	19.5	15.4
TOTAL	12.1	4.0	3.8	20.4	7.9	8.1

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	COLLEGE RULES & PROCEDURES			STUDENT EMPLOYMENT		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=65;W;S)	25.4	19.7	14.0	27.3	15.2	7.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	16.7	18.6	13.0	13.6	6.8	3.7
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	7.8	12.5	9.8	3.9	7.5	2.4
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	15.8	10.9	13.0	17.5	12.7	10.9
Newson (N=80;W;U-S)	21.0	18.3	12.7	24.7	18.3	18.3
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	23.0	19.0	14.6	19.7	17.2	8.3
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	12.5	7.1	4.5	30.0	7.1	9.1
Foster (N=36;M;U)	16.7	18.2	14.3	22.2	9.1	0.0
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	27.5	20.6	14.8	35.0	23.5	14.8
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	12.9	17.0	13.7	22.6	13.2	7.8
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	12.5	14.7	18.4	15.0	5.9	2.6
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	28.2	20.7	8.7	35.1	23.3	4.3
Carter (N=68;M;S)	10.3	8.2	7.4	14.7	4.9	5.6
Lowell (N=40;M;U)	19.0	12.1	13.8	39.0	12.5	6.9
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	18.4	19.5	12.8	46.9	34.1	20.5
TOTAL	17.8	16.0	12.6	23.5	14.0	8.6

TABLE 5-32 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	EMPLOYMENT AFTER EDUCATION			FINANCIAL AID		
	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful	Needed help	Sought help	Found counselor helpful
High						
Meade (N=65;W;S)	7.6	4.5	0.0	23.9	21.2	14.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	10.6	8.5	3.7	18.2	15.3	9.3
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	3.9	0.0	2.4	7.8	12.5	14.6
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	8.8	3.6	0.0	22.8	14.5	8.7
Newson (N=80;W;U-S)	10.0	3.7	2.8	34.6	28.0	25.4
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	13.1	8.6	4.2	34.4	25.9	10.4
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	17.5	7.1	13.6	30.0	14.3	13.6
Foster (N=36;M;U)	8.3	12.1	3.6	33.3	27.3	28.6
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	22.5	8.8	7.4	47.5	23.5	14.8
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	6.5	0.0	0.0	21.0	17.0	11.8
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	2.5	0.0	5.3	32.5	35.3	31.6
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	21.6	10.3	4.3	57.9	40.0	26.1
Carter (N=68;M;S)	4.4	1.6	0.0	7.4	6.6	3.7
Lowell (N=40;M;U)	22.5	3.1	0.0	27.5	9.1	10.3
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	30.6	17.1	15.4	46.9	34.1	25.6
TOTAL	11.9	5.5	3.5	28.1	21.1	15.9

TABLE 5-33

PROBLEMS WITH WHICH STUDENTS REPORTED NEEDING HELP (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Test scores	Grade improvement	Changing major	Changing occupation plans	Study habits improvement	Staying in school
High						
Meade (N=68;W;S)	33.8	33.3	40.3	22.1	18.2	13.6
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	36.4	39.4	28.8	18.2	24.2	21.2
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	23.5	31.4	29.4	11.8	27.5	9.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	22.8	31.6	36.8	26.3	28.1	12.3
Newson (N=80;W;R)	32.5	36.6	37.5	27.5	30.0	12.5
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	36.1	34.4	37.7	32.8	39.3	27.9
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	25.0	32.5	27.5	22.5	45.0	22.5
Foster (N=36;M;U)	30.6	27.8	30.6	33.3	38.9	19.4
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	35.0	35.0	40.0	27.5	37.5	22.5
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	27.4	29.0	21.0	16.1	25.8	8.1
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	27.5	20.0	27.5	22.5	22.5	12.5
Low						
Manning (N=39;B;U)	51.3	37.8	34.2	21.6	36.8	21.6
Carter (N=68;M;S)	16.2	26.5	36.8	25.0	27.9	11.8
Lowell (N=42;M;U)	33.3	43.9	33.3	24.4	41.5	33.3
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	51.0	55.1	28.6	22.4	46.9	22.4
TOTAL	31.7	34.3	33.0	23.5	31.6	17.4

TABLE 5-33 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Getting off academic probation	Selecting classes	Selecting instructors	Selecting transfer college	Future education plans	Personal/ social problems
High						
Meade (N=67;W;S)	10.4	73.9	20.9	35.3	41.2	19.7
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	13.6	50.0	33.3	25.8	39.4	34.8
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	3.9	54.9	13.7	11.8	33.3	11.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	3.5	86.0	35.1	22.8	40.4	14.0
Newson (N=80;W;R)	6.3	67.9	17.5	26.8	41.0	27.5
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	16.4	68.9	37.7	36.1	39.3	16.4
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	7.5	55.0	32.5	37.5	47.5	30.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	8.3	61.1	30.6	19.4	61.1	22.2
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	12.5	65.0	32.5	40.0	52.5	17.5
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	6.5	61.3	35.5	14.5	24.2	14.5
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	7.5	60.0	40.0	15.0	32.5	15.0
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	2.7	71.8	24.3	35.1	39.5	31.6
Carter (N=68;M;S)	5.9	67.6	29.4	33.8	29.4	14.7
Lowell (N=41;M;U)	19.5	63.6	34.1	22.0	43.9	22.5
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	10.2	53.1	30.6	18.4	30.6	22.4
TOTAL	8.9	64.5	29.3	26.4	38.8	20.9

TABLE 5-33 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Problems with family	Self under-standing	College rules & proced-ures	Student employ-ment	Employment after education	Financial aid
High						
Meade (N=65;W;S)	15.4	20.0	25.4	27.3	7.6	23.9
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	16.7	26.2	16.7	13.6	10.6	18.2
Ward (N=51;W;U-S)	5.9	13.7	7.8	3.9	3.9	7.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=57;W;R)	5.3	12.3	15.8	17.5	8.8	22.8
Newson (N=80;W;U-S)	8.8	22.2	21.0	24.7	10.0	34.6
Walden (N=61;W;U-S)	8.2	16.4	23.0	19.7	13.1	34.4
Appleton (N=40;M;U-S)	17.5	25.0	12.5	30.0	17.5	30.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	13.9	27.8	16.7	22.2	8.3	33.3
Langston (N=40;M;U-S)	12.5	20.0	27.5	35.0	22.5	47.5
Shaw (N=62;M;U)	6.5	21.0	12.9	22.6	6.5	21.0
Sherwood (N=40;M;R)	15.0	22.5	12.5	15.0	2.5	32.5
Low						
Manning (N=37;B;U)	21.6	21.1	28.2	35.1	21.6	57.9
Carter (N=68;M;S)	8.8	11.8	10.3	14.7	4.4	7.4
Lowell (N=40;M;U)	20.0	31.7	19.0	39.0	22.5	27.5
Palmerston (N=49;M;R)	16.3	22.4	18.4	46.9	30.6	46.9
TOTAL	12.1	20.4	17.8	23.5	11.9	28.1

TABLE 5-34

PROBLEMS ABOUT WHICH STUDENTS TALKED TO THEIR COUNSELORS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Test scores	Grade improvement	Changing major	Changing occupation plans	Study habit improvement	Staying in school
High						
Meade (N=67;W;S)	22.4	18.2	29.9	13.6	6.1	7.6
Quanto (N=59;W;U-S)	28.8	27.1	27.1	11.9	6.8	15.3
Ward (N=40;W;U-S)	22.5	15.0	30.0	10.0	7.5	12.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=55;W;R)	12.7	16.4	32.7	18.2	16.4	5.5
Newson (N=81;W;R)	25.9	15.9	32.1	24.7	6.2	9.9
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	24.1	17.2	32.8	25.9	15.5	19.0
Appleton (N=28;M;U-S)	7.1	3.6	25.0	17.9	14.3	10.7
Foster (N=33;M;U)	18.2	18.2	24.2	21.2	18.2	21.2
Langston (N=34;M;U-S)	26.5	20.6	29.4	20.6	17.6	14.7
Shaw (N=53;M;U)	26.4	17.0	13.2	3.8	13.2	7.5
Sherwood (N=34;M;R)	23.5	14.7	29.4	20.6	11.8	17.6
Low						
Manning (N=29;B;U)	34.5	20.7	37.9	10.3	27.6	10.0
Carter (N=61;M;S)	9.8	6.6	37.7	19.7	9.8	6.6
Lowell (N=32;M;U)	18.8	21.9	26.5	21.9	9.4	18.8
Palmerston (N=41;M;R)	51.2	26.8	31.7	26.8	22.0	22.0
TOTAL	23.4	17.3	29.6	17.9	12.4	12.5

TABLE 5-34 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Getting off academic probation	Selecting classes	Selecting instructors	Selecting transfer college	Future education plans	Personal/ social problems
High						
Meade (N=66;W;S)	7.6	70.1	11.9	25.8	31.8	10.6
Quanto (N=59;W;U-S)	13.6	42.4	15.3	23.7	37.3	23.7
Ward (N=40;W;U-S)	5.0	57.5	7.5	12.5	27.5	12.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=55;W;R)	1.8	74.5	20.0	21.8	32.7	7.3
Newson (N=31;W;R)	4.9	63.9	12.3	22.0	31.3	7.4
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	8.6	67.2	13.8	20.7	29.3	10.3
Appleton (N=28;;M;U-S)	0.0	57.1	17.9	32.1	35.7	7.1
Foster (N=33;M;U)	6.1	54.5	30.3	27.3	51.5	9.1
Langston (N=34;M;U-S)	14.7	64.7	5.9	32.4	50.0	11.8
Shaw (N=53;M;U)	3.8	64.2	18.9	13.2	22.6	5.7
Sherwood (N=34;M;R)	2.9	67.6	35.3	11.8	26.5	11.8
Low						
Manning (N=29;B;U)	6.9	61.3	17.2	13.8	31.0	20.7
Carter (N=61;M;S)	4.9	67.2	9.8	23.0	21.3	4.9
Lowell (N=32;M;U)	12.5	54.3	12.1	12.1	34.4	3.1
Palmerston (N=41;M;R)	7.3	46.3	26.8	22.0	34.1	24.4
TOTAL	6.7	61.7	16.1	21.1	32.2	11.1

TABLE 5-34 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Problems with family	Self under-standing	College rules & proced-ures	Student employ-ment	Employment after education	Financial aid
High						
Meade (N=66;W;S)	7.6	6.1	19.7	15.2	4.5	21.2
Quanto (N=59;W;U-S)	10.2	15.3	18.6	6.8	8.5	15.3
Ward (N=40;W;U-S)	5.0	5.0	12.5	7.5	0.0	12.5
Middle						
Kinsey (N=55;W;R)	1.8	5.5	10.9	12.7	3.6	14.5
Newson (N=81;W;R)	2.5	4.9	18.3	18.3	3.7	28.0
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	6.9	8.6	19.0	17.2	8.6	25.9
Appleton (N=28;M;U-S)	0.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1	14.3
Foster (N=33;M;U)	3.0	9.1	18.2	9.1	12.1	27.3
Langston (N=34;M;U-S)	0.0	2.9	20.6	23.5	8.8	23.5
Shaw (N=53;M;U)	1.9	5.7	17.0	13.2	0.0	17.0
Sherwood (N=34;M;R)	0.0	17.6	14.7	5.9	0.0	35.3
Low						
Manning (N=29;B;U)	3.4	6.9	20.7	23.3	10.3	40.0
Carter (N=61;M;S)	3.3	3.3	8.2	4.9	1.6	6.6
Lowell (N=32;M;U)	3.1	6.3	12.1	12.5	3.1	9.1
Palmerston (N=41;M;R)	4.9	19.5	19.5	34.1	17.1	34.1
TOTAL	4.0	7.9	16.0	14.0	5.5	21.1

TABLE 5-35

PROBLEMS WITH WHICH STUDENTS FOUND THEIR COUNSELORS HELPFUL
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Test scores	Grade improvement	Changing major	Changing occupation plans	Study habit improvement	Staying in school
High						
Meade (N=57;W;S)	19.3	14.0	24.6	14.0	5.3	7.0
Quanto (N=54;W;U-S)	29.6	18.5	25.9	7.4	3.7	14.8
Ward (N=41;W;U-S)	24.4	17.1	29.3	9.8	7.3	14.6
Middle						
Kinsey (N=46;W;R)	13.0	15.2	26.1	10.9	15.2	6.5
Newson (N=70;W;R)	20.0	11.4	25.7	11.4	5.7	7.1
Walden (N=48;W;U-S)	18.8	12.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	18.8
Appleton (N=22;M;U-S)	4.5	0.0	18.2	9.1	13.6	4.5
Foster (N=28;M;U)	14.3	3.6	21.4	21.4	3.6	14.3
Langston (N=27;M;U-S)	33.3	0.0	22.2	7.4	7.4	7.4
Shaw (N=51;M;U)	23.5	9.8	19.6	3.9	9.8	2.0
Sherwood (N=38;M;R)	21.1	18.4	23.7	26.3	10.5	15.8
Low						
Manning (N=23;B;U)	26.1	13.0	30.4	17.4	17.4	8.7
Carter (N=54;M;S)	9.3	5.6	33.3	11.1	9.3	3.7
Lowell (N=29;M;U)	6.9	13.8	20.7	20.7	10.3	6.9
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	35.9	23.1	20.5	20.5	12.8	12.8
TOTAL	20.3	12.4	24.9	13.9	9.1	9.6

TABLE 5-35 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Getting off academic probation	Selecting classes	Selecting instructors	Selecting transfer college	Future education plans	Personal/ social problems
High						
Meade (N=66;W;S)	5.3	63.2	8.8	15.8	24.6	8.8
Quanto (N=59;W;U-S)	5.6	31.5	9.3	18.5	25.9	20.4
Ward (N=40;W;U-S)	2.4	58.5	7.3	12.2	26.8	9.8
Middle						
Kinsey (N=55;W;R)	0.0	69.6	15.2	15.2	23.9	6.5
Newson (N=31;W;R)	4.3	54.9	7.0	14.1	29.6	8.5
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	6.3	47.9	8.3	10.4	16.7	8.3
Appleton (N=28;M;U-S)	0.0	40.9	13.6	22.7	27.3	13.6
Foster (N=33;M;U)	3.6	46.4	28.6	10.7	25.0	7.1
Langston (N=34;M;U-S)	0.0	37.0	3.7	33.3	29.6	7.4
Shaw (N=53;M;U)	2.0	60.8	13.7	7.8	17.6	3.9
Sherwood (N=34;M;R)	5.3	60.5	31.6	18.4	26.3	10.5
Low						
Manning (N=29;B;U)	0.0	69.6	8.7	13.0	17.4	8.7
Carter (N=61;M;S)	5.6	64.8	11.1	16.7	20.4	5.6
Lowell (N=32;M;U)	3.4	51.7	6.9	10.3	20.7	0.0
Palmerston (N=41;M;R)	5.1	41.0	15.4	20.5	25.6	20.5
TOTAL	3.7	54.0	12.1	15.4	23.9	9.4

TABLE 5-35 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Problems with family	Self under-standing	College rules & proced-ures	Student employ-ment	Employment after education	Financial aid
High						
Meade (N=57;W;S)	8.8	5.3	14.0	7.0	0.0	14.0
Quanto (N=54;W;U-S)	9.3	15.1	13.0	3.7	3.7	9.3
Ward (N=41;W;U-S)	7.3	7.3	9.8	2.4	2.4	14.6
Middle						
Kinsey (N=46;W;R)	0.0	6.5	13.0	10.9	0.0	8.7
Newson (N=71;W;R)	1.4	2.8	12.7	18.3	2.8	25.4
Walden (N=48;W;U-S)	4.2	6.3	14.6	8.3	4.2	10.4
Appleton (N=22;M;U-S)	4.5	9.1	4.5	9.1	13.6	13.6
Foster (N=28;M;U)	0.0	7.1	14.3	0.0	3.6	28.6
Langston (N=27;M;U-S)	3.7	7.4	14.8	14.8	7.4	14.8
Shaw (N=51;M;U)	2.0	5.9	13.7	7.8	0.0	11.8
Sherwood (N=38;M;R)	5.3	23.7	18.4	2.6	5.3	31.6
Low						
Manning (N=23;B;U)	0.0	13.0	8.7	4.3	4.3	26.1
Carter (N=54;M;S)	1.9	3.7	7.4	5.6	0.0	3.7
Lowell (N=29;M;U)	0.0	0.0	13.8	6.9	0.0	10.3
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	5.1	15.4	12.8	20.5	15.4	25.6
TOTAL	3.8	8.1	12.6	8.6	3.5	15.9

TABLE 5-36

AVERAGE NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS STUDENTS REPORTED HAVING WITH COUNSELORS EACH TERM (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	None	1	2-4	More than 4
High				
Meade (N=60;W;S)	11.7	50.0	35.0	3.3
Quanto (N=58;W;U-S)	3.4	29.3	53.4	13.8
Ward (N=30;W;U-S)	30.0	60.0	10.0	0.0
Middle				
Kinsey (N=56;W;R)	8.9	57.1	30.4	3.6
Newson (N=75;W;R)	8.0	36.0	54.7	1.3
Walden (N=30;W;U-S)	30.0	60.0	10.0	0.0
Appleton (N=24;M;U-S)	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Foster (N=31;M;U)	9.7	54.8	25.8	9.7
Langston (N=32;M;U-S)	18.8	40.6	31.3	9.4
Shaw (N=57;M;U)	19.3	45.6	33.3	1.8
Sherwood (N=29;M;R)	10.3	44.8	34.5	10.3
Low				
Manning (N=32;B;U)	9.4	28.1	50.0	12.5
Carter (N=57;M;S)	22.8	57.1	21.1	0.0
Lowell (N=30;M;U)	13.3	56.7	23.3	6.7
Palmerston (N=37;M;R)	32.4	13.5	35.1	18.9
TOTAL	14.0	45.0	35.2	5.7

TABLE 5-37

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EASE IN SEEING A COUNSELOR (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Very easy	Not too difficult	Very difficult	Never tried
High				
Meade (N=82;W;S)	29.3	47.6	9.8	13.4
Quanto (N=76;W;U-S)	52.6	35.5	2.6	9.2
Ward (N=61;W;U-S)	36.1	29.5	0.0	34.4
Middle				
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	36.4	43.9	9.1	10.6
Newson (N=90;W;R)	51.1	40.0	2.2	6.7
Walden (N=70;W;U-S)	37.1	47.1	7.1	8.6
Appleton (N=53;M;U-S)	24.5	30.2	7.5	37.7
Foster (N=45;M;U)	44.4	40.0	2.2	13.3
Langston (N=48;M;U-S)	33.3	35.4	0.0	31.3
Shaw (N=82;M;U)	36.6	42.7	2.4	18.3
Sherwood (N=53;M;R)	52.8	22.6	5.7	18.9
Low				
Manning (N=41;B;U)	26.8	46.3	17.1	9.8
Carter (N=75;M;S)	32.0	50.7	2.7	14.7
Lowell (N=57;M;U)	17.5	31.6	7.0	43.9
Palmerston (N=59;M;R)	40.7	30.5	3.4	25.4
TOTAL	37.4	38.9	5.0	18.7

TABLE 5-38

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR COUNSELORS' DECISION-MAKING STYLE (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Student decides	Both student and counselor decide	Counselor decides
High			
Meade (N=63;W;S)	39.7	58.7	1.6
Quanto (N=61;W;U-S)	21.3	70.5	8.2
Ward (N=34;W;U-S)	14.7	79.4	5.9
Middle			
Kinsey (N=55;W;R)	32.7	56.4	10.9
Newson (N=78;W;R)	25.6	62.8	11.5
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	36.2	46.6	17.2
Appleton (N=26;M;U-S)	46.2	42.3	11.5
Foster (N=31;M;U)	35.5	61.3	3.2
Langston (N=31;M;U-S)	35.5	51.6	12.9
Shaw (N=58;M;U)	31.0	56.9	12.1
Sherwood (N=34;M;R)	20.6	73.5	5.9
Low			
Manning (N=29;B;U)	20.7	69.0	10.3
Carter (N=57;M;S)	28.1	61.4	10.5
Lowell (N=29;M;U)	20.7	62.1	17.2
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	17.9	69.2	12.8
TOTAL	28.7	61.2	10.1

TABLE 5-39

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS WHO FELT THEIR COUNSELORS GAVE THEM ADEQUATE CAREER AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Type of information	
	Occupational	Academic
High		
Meade (N=53;W;S)	67.9	86.2
Quanto (N=50;W;U-S)	70.0	79.7
Ward (N=21;W;U-S)	90.5	96.9
Middle		
Kinsey (N=48;W;R)	60.4	74.5
Newson (N=59;W;R)	84.7	87.5
Walden (N=47;W;U-S)	46.8	66.0
Appleton (N=16;M;U-S)	50.0	47.6
Foster (N=26;M;U)	76.9	76.9
Langston (N=24;M;U-S)	54.2	56.0
Shaw (N=50;M;U)	60.0	72.7
Sherwood (N=17;M;R)	82.4	96.3
Low		
Manning (N=28;B;U)	64.3	73.3
Carter (N=46;M;S)	65.2	85.2
Lowell (N=24;M;U)	54.2	73.3
Palmerston (N=36;M;R)	69.4	78.4
TOTAL	66.4	78.1

TABLE 5-40

STUDENTS' RATING OF THEIR COUNSELORS
ON VARIOUS PERSONAL TRAITS
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	WARM				INFORMATIVE			
	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor
High								
Meade (N=62;W;S)	27.4	67.7	4.8	0.0	39.4	45.5	15.2	0.0
Quanto (N=65;W;U-S)	46.2	49.2	3.1	1.5	46.2	40.0	12.3	1.5
Ward (N=34;W;U-S)	26.5	64.7	5.9	2.9	36.1	61.1	2.8	0.0
Middle								
Kinsey (N=54;W;R)	31.5	59.3	7.4	1.9	31.5	59.3	7.4	1.9
Newson (N=80;W;R)	30.0	51.3	15.0	3.8	28.8	60.0	10.0	1.3
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	15.5	55.2	24.1	5.2	18.9	49.1	26.4	5.7
Appleton (N=25;M;U-S)	44.0	44.0	4.0	8.0	32.0	40.0	12.0	16.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	41.7	47.2	11.1	0.0	36.1	55.6	8.3	0.0
Langston (N=28;M;U-S)	42.9	32.1	14.3	10.7	37.9	44.8	6.9	10.3
Shaw (N=58;M;U)	41.4	39.7	15.5	3.4	42.4	39.0	13.6	5.1
Sherwood (N=35;M;R)	51.4	42.9	5.7	0.0	51.4	45.7	2.9	0.0
Low								
Manning (N=28;B;U)	57.1	32.1	10.7	0.0	62.1	27.6	10.3	0.0
Carter (N=61;M;S)	34.4	52.5	13.1	0.0	34.4	54.1	9.8	1.6
Lowell (N=30;M;U)	26.7	50.0	20.0	3.3	33.3	42.4	18.2	6.1
Palmerston (N=38;M;R)	42.1	42.1	15.8	0.0	55.3	43.2	5.3	5.3
TOTAL	35.7	50.3	11.6	2.5	37.9	47.8	11.3	3.0

TABLE 5-40 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	CONCERNED				OPEN-MINDED			
	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor
High								
Meade (N=64;W;S)	34.4	54.7	4.7	6.3	35.4	55.4	7.7	1.5
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	48.5	43.9	7.6	0.0	43.9	47.0	9.1	0.0
Ward (N=35;W;U-S)	40.0	57.1	2.9	0.0	28.6	71.4	0.0	0.0
Middle								
Kinsey (N=54;W;R)	38.9	48.1	7.4	5.6	33.3	53.7	11.1	1.9
Newson (N=80;W;R)	31.3	48.8	13.8	6.3	27.8	57.0	12.7	2.5
Walden (N=57;W;U-S)	21.1	36.8	35.1	7.0	25.5	40.0	30.9	3.6
Appleton (N=26;M;U-S)	23.1	46.2	23.1	7.7	44.0	40.0	8.0	8.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	38.9	44.4	13.9	2.8	38.2	50.0	11.8	0.0
Langston (N=29;M;U-S)	31.0	37.9	17.2	13.8	41.4	37.9	10.3	10.3
Shaw (N=58;M;U)	37.9	44.8	12.1	5.2	36.8	49.1	10.5	3.5
Sherwood (N=35;M;R)	54.3	42.9	0.0	2.9	48.6	48.6	2.9	0.0
Low								
Manning (N=31;B;U)	61.3	22.6	9.7	6.5	63.3	30.0	3.3	3.3
Carter (N=60;M;S)	25.0	53.3	21.7	0.0	26.7	63.3	10.0	0.0
Lowell (N=33;M;U)	24.2	48.5	21.2	6.1	60.6	40.6	15.6	3.1
Palmerston (N=40;M;R)	52.5	35.0	7.5	5.0	43.6	38.5	10.3	7.7
TOTAL	36.8	45.3	13.2	4.7	36.7	49.8	10.9	2.6

TABLE 5-40 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	INTELLIGENT				AWARE			
	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor
High								
Meade (N=65;W;S)	44.6	46.2	9.2	0.0	39.1	48.4	9.4	3.1
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	53.0	45.5	1.5	0.0	49.2	42.9	6.3	1.6
Ward (N=36;W;U-S)	47.2	50.0	2.8	0.0	33.3	63.6	3.0	0.0
Middle								
Kinsey (N=51;W;R)	41.2	52.9	3.9	2.0	40.7	48.1	9.3	1.9
Newson (N=79;W;R)	38.0	58.2	3.8	0.0	38.8	52.5	5.0	3.8
Walden (N=54;W;U-S)	31.5	63.0	5.6	0.0	19.6	46.4	30.4	3.6
Appleton (N=25;M;U-S)	44.0	44.0	4.0	8.0	20.0	52.0	16.0	12.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	47.2	52.8	0.0	0.0	47.2	47.2	5.6	0.0
Langston (N=28;M;U-S)	39.3	46.4	7.1	7.1	30.8	42.3	15.4	11.5
Shaw (N=56;M;U)	42.9	50.0	7.1	0.0	45.7	51.4	2.9	0.0
Sherwood (N=35;M;R)	51.4	48.6	0.0	0.0	45.7	51.4	2.9	0.0
Low								
Manning (N=31;B;U)	67.7	32.3	0.0	0.0	64.3	32.1	3.6	0.0
Carter (N=61;M;S)	41.0	57.4	1.6	0.0	31.7	50.0	16.7	1.7
Lowell (N=32;M;U)	40.6	46.9	9.4	3.1	32.3	48.4	16.1	3.2
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	61.5	33.3	5.1	0.0	56.4	25.6	15.4	2.6
TOTAL	45.1	49.9	4.2	0.9	39.3	45.9	11.6	3.2

TABLE 5-40 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	EASY TO TALK TO				PATIENT			
	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor
High								
Meade (N=65;W;S)	41.5	44.6	12.3	1.5	46.2	41.5	12.3	0.0
Quanto (N=66;W;U-S)	59.1	36.4	3.0	1.5	50.8	41.5	6.2	1.5
Ward (N=36;W;U-S)	47.2	52.8	0.0	0.0	47.1	47.1	5.9	0.0
Middle								
Kinsey (N=54;W;R)	51.9	38.9	7.4	1.9	37.0	48.1	11.1	3.7
Newson (N=80;W;R)	36.3	47.5	12.5	3.8	30.0	51.3	15.0	3.8
Walden (N=58;W;U-S)	31.0	55.2	13.8	0.0	26.3	56.1	14.0	3.5
Appleton (N=25;M;U-S)	40.0	40.0	4.0	16.0	40.0	44.0	8.0	8.0
Foster (N=36;M;U)	50.0	38.9	5.6	5.6	51.4	40.0	5.7	2.9
Langston (N=30;M;U-S)	46.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	37.0	37.0	18.5	7.4
Shaw (N=60;M;U)	53.3	38.3	3.3	5.0	48.3	36.2	10.3	5.2
Sherwood (N=35;M;R)	60.0	37.1	2.9	0.0	57.1	42.9	0.0	0.0
Low								
Manning (N=31;B;U)	58.1	38.7	3.2	0.0	69.0	24.1	3.4	3.4
Carter (N=60;M;S)	45.0	40.0	15.0	0.0	46.7	38.3	15.0	0.0
Lowell (N=33;M;U)	39.4	39.4	12.1	9.1	40.0	43.3	13.3	3.3
Palmerston (N=39;M;R)	56.4	30.8	5.1	7.7	53.8	35.9	2.6	7.7
TOTAL	47.0	41.5	8.2	3.2	44.0	42.9	10.1	3.0

TABLE 5-40 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	SYMPATHETIC			
	Very good	Above average	Below average	Poor
High				
Meade (N=63;W;S)	27.0	47.6	19.0	6.3
Quanto (N=64;W;U-S)	39.1	43.8	15.6	1.6
Ward (N=32;W;U-S)	28.1	59.4	9.4	3.1
Middle				
Kinsey (N=50;W;R)	28.0	46.0	18.0	8.0
Newson (N=77;W;R)	14.3	59.7	18.2	7.8
Walden (N=49;W;U-S)	12.2	46.9	30.6	10.2
Appleton (N=23;M;U-S)	26.1	34.8	21.7	17.4
Foster (N=32;M;U)	31.3	43.8	18.8	6.3
Langston (N=25;M;U-S)	28.0	48.0	20.0	4.0
Shaw (N=55;M;U)	43.6	40.0	12.7	3.6
Sherwood (N=35;M;R)	42.9	42.9	14.3	0.0
Low				
Manning (N=26;B;U)	57.7	30.8	3.8	7.7
Carter (N=58;M;S)	25.9	53.4	20.7	0.0
Lowell (N=31;M;S)	19.4	58.1	16.1	6.5
Palmerston (N=37;M;R)	43.2	43.2	5.4	8.1
TOTAL	29.8	47.6	16.9	5.6

TABLE 5-41

COMPOSITE OF STUDENTS WHO CONSIDERED THEIR COLLEGES' COUNSELING AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES AS "STRONG"

(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Admissions & registration	Records & information	Academic counseling	Vocational counseling
High				
Meade (N=78;W;S)	25.3	25.3	40.5	30.4
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	32.9	21.1	33.3	31.1
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	30.0	21.7	30.5	22.4
Middle				
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	16.7	22.7	29.9	22.4
Newson (N=88;W;R)	27.3	22.7	31.8	28.4
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	10.1	13.0	13.0	10.3
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	21.2	10.0	10.0	6.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	22.5	25.0	27.5	24.4
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	15.9	11.1	13.3	13.3
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	27.3	17.1	22.4	18.4
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	17.6	17.1	38.0	38.8
Low				
Manning (N=42;B;U)	28.6	21.4	24.4	29.3
Carter (N=72;M;S)	27.4	24.7	23.6	23.6
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	20.7	19.3	14.0	19.3
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	18.6	15.5	24.6	24.6
TOTAL	23.2	19.1	25.8	23.1

TABLE 5-41 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Job placement	Financial aids	Student activities	Special counseling for dis-advantaged students	Special counseling for students with academic problems
High					
Meade (N=78;W;S)	15.4	20.5	19.2	22.1	17.9
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	15.3	18.3	24.3	23.3	26.0
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	5.5	19.6	10.3	12.1	13.8
Middle					
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	9.1	12.1	15.4	12.3	12.1
Newson (N=88;W;R)	13.6	14.8	27.6	10.2	10.2
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	14.5	10.4	27.5	18.2	13.4
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	4.0	7.8	7.8	8.0	10.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	9.8	19.5	22.0	19.5	24.4
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	6.7	4.7	14.0	7.1	11.9
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	10.5	13.0	9.5	24.7	23.4
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	6.1	30.6	10.2	26.5	30.6
Low					
Manning (N=42;B;U)	9.8	23.8	43.9	38.1	40.5
Carter (N=72;M;S)	4.2	5.6	6.9	16.7	16.7
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	12.3	11.9	12.1	8.6	5.2
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	19.0	27.6	13.8	12.3	15.5
TOTAL	10.8	15.7	17.5	17.2	17.5

TABLE 5-42

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
OF THEIR COLLEGES' STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES
(in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Admissions and registration				Records and information			
	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know
High								
Meade (N=78;W'S)	25.3	48.1	19.0	7.6	25.3	54.4	7.6	12.7
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	32.9	53.4	11.0	2.7	21.1	62.0	4.2	12.7
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	30.0	51.7	3.3	15.0	21.7	55.0	5.0	18.3
Middle								
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	16.7	57.6	18.2	7.6	22.7	50.0	10.6	16.7
Newson (N=88;W;R)	27.3	55.7	14.8	2.3	22.7	59.1	2.3	15.9
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	10.1	47.8	37.7	4.3	13.0	55.1	18.8	13.0
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	21.2	36.5	23.1	19.2	10.0	44.0	16.0	30.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	22.5	37.5	22.5	17.5	25.0	40.0	17.5	17.5
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	15.9	54.5	15.9	13.6	11.1	64.4	8.9	15.6
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	27.3	46.8	20.8	5.2	17.1	63.2	6.6	13.2
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	17.6	49.0	19.6	13.7	17.1	63.2	6.6	13.2
Low								
Manning (N=42;B;U)	28.6	33.3	28.6	9.5	21.4	42.9	23.8	11.9
Carter (N=72;M;S)	27.4	60.3	5.5	6.8	24.7	53.4	4.1	17.8
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	20.7	43.1	19.0	17.2	19.3	43.9	10.5	26.3
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	18.6	52.5	15.3	13.6	15.5	60.3	13.8	10.3
TOTAL	23.2	49.5	17.8	9.5	19.1	54.5	10.5	15.9

TABLE 5-42 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Academic counseling				Vocational counseling			
	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know
High								
Meade (N=78;W;S)	40.5	32.9	12.7	13.9	30.4	34.2	16.5	19.0
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	33.3	41.3	17.3	8.0	31.1	37.8	17.6	13.5
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	30.5	37.3	8.5	23.7	22.4	32.8	6.9	37.9
Middle								
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	29.9	47.8	14.9	7.5	22.4	38.8	19.4	19.4
Newson (N=88;W;R)	31.8	55.7	8.0	4.5	28.4	48.9	11.4	11.4
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	13.0	46.4	30.4	10.1	10.3	44.1	26.5	19.1
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	10.0	34.0	30.0	26.0	6.0	30.0	28.0	36.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	27.5	52.5	7.5	12.5	24.4	43.9	7.3	24.4
Langston (N=44;M:U-S)	13.3	37.8	26.7	22.2	13.3	35.6	22.2	28.9
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	22.4	46.1	17.1	14.5	18.4	39.5	14.5	27.6
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	38.0	36.0	10.0	16.0	38.8	32.7	8.2	20.4
Low								
Manning (N=42;B;U)	24.4	29.3	24.4	22.0	29.3	24.4	22.0	24.4
Carter (N=72;M;S)	23.6	52.8	8.3	15.3	23.6	42.1	9.7	23.6
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	14.0	35.1	17.5	33.3	19.3	24.6	10.5	45.6
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	24.6	43.9	21.1	10.5	24.6	50.9	12.3	12.3
TOTAL	25.8	42.7	16.4	15.0	23.1	38.2	15.4	23.3

TABLE 5-42 (Continued)

	Job placement				Financial aids			
Institution by socioeconomic level	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know
High								
Meade (N=78,W;S)	15.4	35.9	11.5	37.2	20.5	32.1	9.0	38.5
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	15.3	40.3	18.1	26.4	18.3	45.1	11.3	25.4
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	5.5	20.0	14.5	60.0	19.6	33.9	0.0	46.4
Middle								
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	9.1	22.7	22.7	45.5	12.1	22.7	12.1	53.0
Newson (N=88;W;R)	13.6	39.8	18.2	28.4	14.8	44.3	15.9	25.0
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	14.5	37.7	15.9	31.9	10.4	38.8	11.9	38.8
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	4.0	24.0	26.0	46.0	7.8	17.6	27.5	47.1
Foster (N=41;M;U)	9.8	26.8	12.2	51.2	19.5	24.4	17.1	39.0
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	6.7	28.9	26.7	37.8	4.7	23.3	32.6	39.5
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	10.5	23.7	13.2	52.6	13.0	39.0	9.1	39.0
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	6.1	46.9	4.1	42.9	30.6	32.7	10.2	26.5
Low								
Manning (N=42;B;U)	9.8	39.0	14.6	36.6	23.8	31.0	26.2	19.0
Carter (N=72;M;S)	4.2	28.2	15.5	52.1	5.6	35.2	7.0	52.1
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	12.3	17.5	21.1	49.1	11.9	23.7	5.1	59.3
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	19.0	37.9	31.0	12.1	27.6	39.7	24.1	8.6
TOTAL	10.8	31.6	17.6	40.1	15.7	33.4	13.6	37.3

TABLE 5-42 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Student activities				Special counseling for disadvantaged students			
	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know
High								
Meade (N=78;W;S)	19.2	30.8	30.8	19.2	22.1	22.1	5.2	50.6
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	24.3	44.6	28.4	2.7	23.3	31.5	5.5	39.7
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	10.3	34.5	12.1	43.1	12.1	12.1	5.2	70.7
Middle								
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	15.4	38.5	12.3	33.8	12.3	15.4	10.8	61.5
Newson (N=88;W;R)	27.6	46.0	18.4	8.0	10.2	34.1	14.8	40.9
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	27.5	46.4	15.9	10.1	18.2	18.2	19.7	43.9
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	7.8	23.5	33.3	35.3	8.0	22.0	16.0	54.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	22.0	26.8	17.1	34.1	19.5	9.8	7.3	63.4
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	14.0	34.9	25.6	25.6	7.1	16.7	26.2	50.0
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	9.5	35.1	25.7	29.7	24.7	23.4	5.2	46.8
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	10.2	46.9	22.4	20.4	26.5	30.6	0.0	42.9
Low								
Manning (N=42;B;U)	43.9	34.1	9.8	12.2	38.1	16.7	16.7	28.6
Carter (N=72;M;S)	6.9	41.7	29.2	22.2	16.7	20.8	8.3	54.2
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	12.1	24.1	13.8	50.0	8.6	10.3	15.5	65.5
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	13.8	32.8	48.3	5.2	12.3	36.8	31.6	19.3
TOTAL	17.5	36.8	23.2	22.4	17.2	22.2	12.0	48.6

TABLE 5-42 (Continued)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Special counseling for students with academic problems			
	Strong	Average	Weak	Don't know
High				
Meade (N=78;W;S)	17.9	29.5	9.0	43.6
Quanto (N=73;W;U-S)	26.0	42.5	8.2	23.3
Ward (N=58;W;U-S)	13.8	20.7	6.9	58.6
Middle				
Kinsey (N=66;W;R)	12.1	19.7	10.6	57.6
Newson (N=88;W;R)	10.2	43.2	12.5	34.1
Walden (N=68;W;U-S)	13.4	29.9	16.4	40.3
Appleton (N=51;M;U-S)	10.0	24.0	16.0	50.0
Foster (N=41;M;U)	24.4	9.8	7.3	58.5
Langston (N=44;M;U-S)	11.9	21.4	23.8	42.9
Shaw (N=76;M;U)	23.4	24.7	7.8	44.2
Sherwood (N=50;M;R)	30.6	26.5	2.0	40.8
Low				
Manning (N=42;B;U)	40.5	16.7	16.7	26.2
Carter (N=72;M;S)	16.7	29.2	6.9	47.2
Lowell (N=58;M;U)	5.2	24.1	12.1	58.6
Palmerston (N=58;M;R)	15.5	36.2	29.3	19.0
TOTAL	17.5	28.0	12.0	42.5

TABLE 5-43

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS REPORTING ATTENDING THE COLLEGE OF THEIR CHOICE (in Percent)

Institution by socioeconomic level	Ideal choice	Present choice
High		
Meade (N=245;W;S)	45.6	78.0
Quanto (N=229;W;U-S)	39.3	79.5
Ward (N=222;W;U-S)	51.6	89.2
Middle		
Kinsey (N=204;W;R)	66.3	85.3
Newson (N=263;W;R)	67.3	90.9
Walden (N=225;W;U-S)	38.2	80.0
Appleton (N=167;M;U-S)	51.0	84.4
Foster (N=159;M;U)	40.9	71.7
Langston (N=157;M;U-S)	47.1	79.6
Shaw (N=231;M;U)	43.6	78.8
Sherwood (N=181;M;R)	81.5	91.2
Low		
Manning (N=119;B;U)	58.6	88.2
Carter (N=234;M;S)	60.7	82.1
Lowell (N=183;M;U)	57.6	77.0
Palmerston (N=185;M;R)	53.8	86.5
TOTAL	53.5	82.9

APPENDIX D

FACULTY MARGINAL DATA
AND
TABLES TO CHAPTER 6

302/303

O.M.B. No. 51-S71038E
APPROVAL EXPIRES 6-30-72

THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

MARGINALS

AND

% MISSING OBSERVATIONS (IN PARENTHESES)

Center for the Study of Evaluation
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Office of Education Contract No. 0-70-4795
OE FORM 2337, 11/71

Dear Colleague:

You have been randomly chosen to participate in a nationwide study of a select group of community colleges. This study is being undertaken by the Higher Education Project of U.C.L.A.'s Center for the Study of Evaluation under contract to the National Center for Educational Statistics of the Office of Education. The Study is designed to provide suggestions to the Office of Education for more effective development of community or two-year colleges in their effort to serve students.

By taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire you will be making a significant contribution toward bridging the gap between action at the federal level and real needs at colleges such as yours.

Be assured that responses to this questionnaire will be analyzed in a statistical sense only and that your anonymity will be absolutely protected by your following the directions listed below.

1. Do not write your name on this booklet.

2. When you have completed this questionnaire, please write your name and school in the space provided on the attached postcard (on the left).

3. Detach the postcard and return it in a mailing separate from the questionnaire.

This procedure allows us to know who has not returned the questionnaire while preserving the strict anonymity of the questionnaire respondents themselves. We will then be able to send follow-up requests to the non-respondents. At no time will your responses be seen by anyone from your institution.

We will be very grateful if you would complete and return this questionnaire to us within 5 days. We thank you in advance for the time taken from your schedule to complete this questionnaire.

Very Sincerely,

James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire contains items about your general educational and occupational background and your attitudes and perceptions related to the junior college. We hope you will respond to all of the items, but feel free to skip any item you prefer not to answer.

YOUR GENERAL BACKGROUND

1. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE WHERE YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED? ______________________

2. WHAT WAS YOUR AGE AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1971? See below*

3. WHAT IS YOUR SEX? 1. 70 Male 2. 30 Female (1)

4. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

1. ______ Married 3. ______ Separated, Divorced
2. ______ Never Married 4. ______ Widowed

5. HOW MANY CHILDREN DO YOU HAVE?

1. ______ None 3. ______ 3–4
2. ______ 1–2 4. ______ 5 or more

6. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUP? (Please check one)

1. .4% American Indian
2. 90 Caucasian/White
3. 7 Negro/Black
4. 1 Oriental,
5. ______ Spanish Surname: a. 1 Mexican American/Chicano (3)
b. .6 Puerto Rican
c. ______ Other (Please specify: ______________)
6. ______ Other (Please specify: ______________________________)

*Age of Faculty

22-30	16%
31-50	59%
> 50	26
	(3%)

7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES THE COMMUNITY YOU CONSIDER TO BE YOUR HOME (a) WHEN YOU WERE AN ADOLESCENT AND (b) AT PRESENT (Please check each column once)

	(a) **Adolescent**	(b) **At Present**
1. Large City (over 500,000		
a. Within the city		26
b. In a suburb of the city		22
2. City (50,000 to 500,000)		
a. Within the city		19
b. In a suburb of the city		11
3. Small City or Town (less than 50,000)		18
4. Farm or Open Country		4
		(3)

8. DO YOU LIVE WITHIN 10 MILES OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE WHERE YOU TEACH?

1. ______ Yes

2. ______ No

9. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS COMPRISE 10 PERCENT OR MORE OF THE POPULATION OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD (a) WHILE IN HIGH SCHOOL AND (b) AT PRESENT (Please check all that apply)

	(a) **While in High School**	(b) **At Present**
1. American Indian	1.5	1
2. Caucasian White	90	90
3. Negro Black	15	20
4. Oriental	3	5
5. Spanish Surname (Mexican-American Chicano, Puerto Rican)	9	17
6. Other (Please specify ______)	3	1
	(3)	(2)

10. WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF THE AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD (a) WHEN YOU WERE AN ADOLESCENT AND (b) AT PRESENT? (Please check each column once.)

	(a) **Adolescent**	(b) **At Present**
1. Less than $3,000		-
2. $ 3,001 to $ 6,000		3
3. $ 6,001 to $10,000		23
4. $10,001 to $15,000		43
5. $15,001 to $25,000		27
6. Over $25,000		5
		(3)

11. WHAT IS YOUR RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND THAT OF YOUR PARENTS? (Please check each column once; if your parents are deceased, indicate their religious affiliation when they were alive.)

	Self	**Father**	**Mother**
1. Catholic	20	21	23
2. Jewish	4	5	5
3. Protestant	54	65	67
4. None	18	7	3
5. Other (please specify:)	4	2	2
	(2)	(3)	(2)

12. HOW MANY BOOKS WERE IN YOUR HOME WHEN YOU WERE 17 YEARS OLD?

1. 19 Under 25
2. 19 26 - 50
3. 24 51 - 100
4. 16 101 - 200
5. 16 201 - 500
6. 7 Over 500

(1)

13. PLEASE INDICATE THE OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF BOTH YOUR FATHER AND MOTHER WHEN YOU WERE 17 YEARS OLD; AND YOUR SPOUSE'S CURRENT OCCUPATION, IF MARRIED. (Please check each column once.)

	Father	Mother	Spouse
1. General worker (such as custodian, farm laborer, general and domestic laborer)	7	4	.4
2. Semi-skilled worker (such as machine operator, retail clerk, waitress, truck driver, mail carrier, barber)	16	6	2
3. Skilled clerical or sales (such as bookkeeper, sales representative, secretary)	8	7	11
4. Skilled craftsman or foreman (such as electrician, baker, carpenter, bricklayer, factory foreman	18	1	3
5. Protective service worker (such as policeman, military, fireman)	2	-	1
6. Owner or manager of small business or firm (such as insurance or real estate agent, store proprietor, contractor)	17	3	3
7. Farm owner or manager	9	.4	.4
8. Semiprofessional or technician (such as programmer, lab technician)	1	1	3
9. Managerial and professional I (such as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, school teacher, engineer, certified public accountant)	16	8	31
10. Managerial and Professional II (such as physician, professor, lawyer)	6	1	8
11. Housewife		66	37
12. Retired			
13. Unemployed		1	2
14. Does not apply			
	(3)	(4)	(24)

14. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST FORMAL EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ATTAINED BY YOUR MOTHER AND FATHER? (Please check each column once.)

	Mother		Father	
1. 8th grade or less	26	43	31	47
2. Some high school	17		16	
3. High school graduate	27		18	
4. Vocational-technical or business training beyond high school	5		7	
5. Some college	13		10	
6. Bachelor's degree	8	14	7	18
7. Some graduate work	3		3	
8. Master's degree	2		2	
9. Doctorate or professional degree	.5		6	
10. Don't know				
	(2)		(2)	

15. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE DEGREES YOU HAVE EARNED AND AT WHAT TYPE OF INSTITUTION UNDER SECTION "a." IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY WORKING TOWARD A DEGREE, PLEASE INDICATE WHICH DEGREE AND AT WHAT TYPE OF INSTITUTION UNDER SECTION "b." (Please check each section, "a" and "b," if applicable.)

	(a) Earned Degrees				(b) Current Work			
	AA	BA	MA	Prof. Ed.D. Ph.D.	AA	3A	MA	Prof. Ed.D. Ph.D.
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Public Junior College	64				8			
2. Private Junior College	17				—			
3. Public Teachers College	1	7	2		—	4	2	
4. Private Teachers College	1	1	1		—	65	23	
5. Public Four-year College	3	21	14	5	—	17	12	5
6. Private Four-year College	11	27	9	3	—	13	54	10
7. Public University	1	30	47	47	—	—	10	58
8. Private University	3	14	26	44	—	—	—	25
9. Other (please specify: ______	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	3
10. Does not apply	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	(80)	(19)	(27)	(89)	(99)	(97)	(93)	(80)

16. PLEASE INDICATE THE MAJOR FIELD IN WHICH YOU HAVE EARNED EACH OF YOUR DEGREES IN COLUMN "a" (1 through 4). INDICATE THE FIELD(S) IN WHICH YOU ARE NOW DOING ACADEMIC WORK IN COLUMN "b" (5). INDICATE THE FIELD(S) IN WHICH YOU ARE NOW TEACHING IN COLUMN "c" (6). (Please check each column where applicable.)

	(a) Degree(s) earned				(b) Current Academic Work	(c) Teaching area
	AA	BA	MA	Prof. Ed.D. Ph.D.		
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Physical science	8	12	13	15	7	12
2. Engineering	3	5	2	1	3	3
3. Biological science	3	6	6	6	5	5
4. Social science	17	18	18	15	13	15
5. Fine arts	7	7	6	4	5	7
6. Humanities	17	19	20	16	14	18
7. Medical science (M.D., Dentistry, Pharmacy, etc.)	-	.2	.2	6	0	1
8. Law	2	.2	21	11	2	1
9. Education	6	15	.2	23	32	5
10. Architecture	-	.3	10	1	0	.6
11. Agriculture, forestry	-	1	3	-	0	.6
12. Business	11	11	1	-	8	11
13. Health services (Nursing, medical technology, etc.)	3	4	1	-	1	4
14. Public-personnel service (police science, home economics, etc.)	-	1	-	-	1	2
15. Trade-technical	23	2		1	8	15
16. Does not apply						
	(84)	(20)	(28)	(90)	(58)	(22)

17. IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU RECEIVE YOUR HIGHEST DEGREE? ________

1926-1940 - 5%
1941-1959 - 32%
1960-1972 - 63%

18. IF YOU ARE PRESENTLY WORKING TOWARDS A DEGREE, WHEN DO YOU EXPECT TO RECEIVE IT? __________

Does not apply __________ 1972-1973 52% After 1975 8%
1974-1975 40% N.A. (79)

19. HAVE YOU COMPLETED THE REQUIREMENTS OR ARE YOU TAKING COURSES TOWARD AN ADMINISTRATIVE, COUNSELING OR OTHER NON-TEACHING POSITION?

1. 18 Yes
2. 77 No
(4)

IF YES, WHICH POSITION? (If you have completed the requirements, please write in the year in column "a." If you are presently taking courses, please check column "b.")

(See below)	(a) Year completed	(b) Current courses
1. Administrative	______	______
2. Counseling	______	______
3. Other (Please specify: __________ ________________)	______	______
4. Does not apply	______	______

20. IN WHAT YEAR DID YOU LAST TAKE A COURSE IN YOUR MAJOR FIELD?
1932-1960 - 12%; 1961-1972 - 88%; (5)

21. HAVE YOU EVER ATTENDED A JUNIOR COLLEGE OR A TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL INSTITUTE? (Please check each line, "Yes" or "No")

	Yes	No	N.A.
1. Junior college	38	62	(2)
2. Two-year technical institute	7	93	(29)

YOUR OCCUPATIONAL POSITION AND BACKGROUND

22. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN A JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHER?
1-2 - 10%; 3-5 - 42%; 6-10 - 30%; over 10 - 19%; (1)

23. WHAT YEAR WERE YOU HIRED BY THIS DISTRICT OR INSTITUTION?
1936-50 - 5%; 1951-60 - 14%; 1961-72 - 82%; (2)

24. ARE YOU WORKING FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME AT THIS INSTITUTION?

1. 87 Full-time
2. 13 Part-time
(0)

19. IF YES, WHICH POSITION?

	(a) Year completed	(b) Courses completed
1. Administrative:	1932-1942 - 12% 1943-1960 - 27 1961-1972 - 62 (92)	33.3 (90)
2. Counseling:	1942-1959 - 26% 1960-1972 - 74 (95)	19 (91)
3. Other:	(98)	12 (91)

25. IF THIS INSTITUTION GRANTS TENURE (SECURITY OF EMPLOYMENT), DO YOU HAVE IT?

1. 66 Yes
2. 35 No
3. ______ Does not apply

(2)

26. WHAT IS YOUR REGULAR WORKING SCHEDULE AT THIS INSTITUTION? (Exclusive of teaching preparation)

1. 58 Days
2. 11 Nights
3. 31 Days and Nights

(1)

27. ARE THE COURSES YOU TEACH PRIMARILY OCCUPATIONAL/VOCATIONAL, REMEDIAL/DEVELOPMENTAL, OR TRANSFER/GENERAL EDUCATION?

1. 35 Occupational/vocational
2. 4 Remedial/developmental
3. 61 Transfer/general education

(11)

28. HOW MANY HOURS ON THE AVERAGE DO YOU WORK PER WEEK IN THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES? (Please answer as many items as apply.)

1. ______ Instructor (See Page 8a)
2. ______ Institutional researcher
3. ______ Counselor
4. ______ Administrator (dean or above)
5. ______ Administrator below dean (department or division chairman, coordinator, etc.)
6. ______ Other (Please specify: ______________________________)

29. IF YOU TEACH AT THIS INSTITUTION AS PART OF YOUR REGULAR ASSIGNMENT, HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU SPEND IN THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (Please write in the number of hours for each applicable activity.)

(See Page 8a)

1. ______ In class
2. ______ Preparing materials for class
3. ______ Correcting exams, reports, written assignments, etc.
4. ______ Meeting with students
5. ______ Supervising student activities (clubs, social events, etc.)
6. ______ Committee meetings related to institutional functioning, e.g., departmental meetings, budget, curriculum, etc.

28. HOW MANY HOURS ON THE AVERAGE DO YOU WORK PER WEEK IN THE FOLLOWING CAPACITIES? (Please answer as many items as apply.)

1. Instructor: 0-5 hours - 11% response
6-20 - 44
> 20 - 45
(2)

2. Institutional researcher: 0 hours - 97% response
1-2 - .8
3-4 - .6
> 4 - 1.9

3. Counselor: 0 hours - 84% response
1-4 - 7
5-40 - 9
(2)

4. Administrator (dean or above): 0 hours - 99% response
(2)

5. Administrator below dean: 0 hours - 82% response
1-20 - 12
> 20 - 7
(2)

29. IF YOU TEACH AT THIS INSTITUTION AS PART OF YOUR REGULAR ASSIGNMENT, HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU SPEND IN THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (Please write in the number of hours for each applicable activity)

1. In class: 0-5 hours - 15% response
6-20 - 70
> 20 - 15
(5)

2. Preparing materials for class: 0-5 hours - 38% response
6-10 - 35
11-15 - 16
> 16 - 11
(4)

3. Correcting exams, reports, etc.: 0 hours - 11% response
1-5 - 58
6-10 - 23
> 10 - 8
(5)

4. Meeting with students: 0 hours - 15% response
1-5 - 63
6-10 - 17
> 10 - 5
(5)

5. Supervising student activities: 0 hours - 80% response
1 - 9
>2 - 11

6. Committee meetings related to institutional functioning: 0 hours - 30%
1 -

0 hours - 30% response
1 - 25
2-3 - 29
> 4 - 16

7. Activities involving professional teacher organizations:

0 hours - 76% response
1 - 16
>2 - 8

8. Administrative duties: 0 hours - 79% response
1-10 - 14
> 10 - 7
(4)

9. Other teaching related activities: 0 hours - 82% response
1-5 - 14
> 5 - 4
(5)

10. Other non-teaching duties: 0 hours - 88% response
> 0 - 12
(5)

29. 7. ______ Activities involving professional teacher organizations

8. ______ Administrative duties

9. ______ Other teaching related activities (See page 8b)

(Please specify: ______________________________)

10. ______ Other non-teaching duties (Please specify: ______________________________)

30. (A) DO YOU WORK ADDITIONAL HOURS BEYOND THOSE CONSIDERED PART OF YOUR REGULAR DUTIES AT THIS INSTITUTION? (Exclusive of summer.)

1. 43 Yes
2. 57 No

(4)

(B) IF YES, HOW MANY EXTRA HOURS DO YOU WORK PER WEEK IN THE FOLLOWING TEACHING POSITIONS? (For each position, please indicate in column "a" the number of classroom hours, and in column "b" the number of hours in preparation for teaching.)

(See page 9a)

	(a) Classroom hours per week	(b) Preparation hours per week
1. At a secondary or elementary school		
2. At a four-year college or university		
3. At another junior college		
4. At a technical institute		
5. Extra teaching load at this institution		
6. Other (Please specify: ______________________________)		

(C) IF YES, HOW MANY EXTRA HOURS DO YOU WORK PER WEEK IN A NON-TEACHING POSITION? (Please describe the position and indicate the number of hours)

1. Position Yes = 81% (22)
2. Hours per week 1-5 hours - 25%; 6-20 hours - 40%; 20 hours - 35%; (80)

30(B). IF YES, HOW MANY EXTRA HOURS DO YOU WORK PER WEEK IN THE FOLLOWING TEACHING POSITIONS? (For each position, please indicate in column "a" the number of classroom hours, and in column "b" the number of hours in preparation for teaching.)

	(a) Classroom hours per week	(b) Preparation hours per week
1. At a secondary or elementary school	0 - 93% (69)	0 - 93% (69)
2. At a four-year college or university	0 - 92% (69)	0 - 93% (69)
3. At another junior college	0 - 94% (69)	0 - 96% (69)
4. At a technical institute	0 - 96% (69)	0 - 97% (69)
5. Extra teaching load at this institution	0 - 47% 1-2 - 5% 3 - 29% > 4 - 19%	0 - 54% 1 - 11% 2 - 12% 3 - 9% >4 - 14% (69)
6. Other	0 - 86% (71)	0 - 90% (70)

31. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES? (Please check the appropriate column for each item.)

	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom or Never	NA
1. Lecture	68	26	7	(6)
2. Instructor led discussion	62	32	5	(10)
3. Small group discussion	24	49	26	(18)
4. Autotutorial	10	26	64	(29)
5. Audiovisual	36	48	16	(11)
6. Group projects and reports	20	46	34	(19)
7. Individual project and reports	40	45	14	(14)
8. Class drills or quizzes	49	35	17	(10)
9. Other (please specify: ____________)	53	22	25	(87)

32. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE FOLLOWING EVALUATION TECHNIQUES IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF A FINAL GRADE? (Please check the appropriate column for each item.)

	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom or Never	NA
1. Midterm examinations	63	15	22	(11)
2. Quizzes	69	21	10	(7)
3. Class or laboratory projects	54	22	24	(16)
4. Participation in class projects	43	30	27	(20)
5. Short written reports	36	38	26	(17)
6. Term papers	21	31	48	(20)
7. Book reports	14	26	61	(24)
8. Final examinations	84	10	7	(6)
9. Attendance in class	46	25	30	(13)
10. Other (please specify: ____________)	79	8	13	(84)

INFORMATION CONCERNING PRESENT POSITION

33. HOW DID YOU FIRST LEARN ABOUT YOUR PRESENT POSITION?

(Check only one.)

1. 44 By direct or indirect contact with someone employed by this institution
2. 1 By notice of vacancy sent to previous employer
3. 7 At my college placement service
4. 3 Through a professional organization (e.g., teachers' association, scholarship or research organization)
5. 34 Self-initiated application
6. 11 Other (Please specify: ______________________)

(4)

34. WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS YOU CHOSE THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE? (Mark 1 for the most important, 2 for the next most important and 3 for the third most important.)

	I		II	III
1.	5	Friends at this institution	6	9
2.	43	Wanted to teach at college level	17	10
3.	7	Desirable location	25	18
4.	3	Salary	12	18
5.	12	Best job-offer at the time	8	11
6.	3	Needed job while earning higher degree	3	1
7.	12	Stimulating environment	15	15
8.	6	Dissatisfied with previous position	10	13
9.	9	Other (Please specify: ______)	3	4
	(20)		(32)	(34)

35. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU AND YOUR COLLEAGUES REGARDING EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS? (Indicate your feelings in column "a" and indicate in column "b" how you think most of your colleagues would answer according to the following code:

(See page 12a)

1	2	3
satisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied

	(a) Your feelings	(b) Your colleagues' feelings
1. Policy related to promotion and tenure	______	______
2. Job security, generally	______	______
3. Assignments outside of classroom	______	______
4. Salary schedule	______	______
5. Job prestige	______	______
6. Work load (amount of hours)	______	______
7. Policy of board of trustees	______	______
8. Policies of state governing agencies	______	______
9. Opportunity for attending professional meetings	______	______
10. School-community relationships	______	______
11. Relationship with administrators	______	______
12. Class size	______	______
13. Quality of students	______	______
14. Attitudes of students and behavior	______	______
15. Facilities	______	______
16. Relationship with academic faculty	______	______
17. Relationship with vocational faculty	______	______
18. Library facilities	______	______
19. Other (Please specify)	______	______

____

35. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU AND YOUR COLLEAGUES REGARDING EACH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS? (Indicate your feelings in column "a" and indicate in column "b" how you think most of your colleagues would answer according to the following code:

1	2	3
satisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied

	(a) Your feelings				(b) Your colleagues' feelings			
	1	2	3	N.A.	1	2	3	N.A.
1. Policy related to promotion and tenure	59	24	17	(4)	47	30	22	(14)
2. Job security, generally	76	17	8	(3)	66	25	9	(14)
3. Assignments outside of classroom	69	24	7	(6)	57	34	9	(16)
4. Salary schedule	59	24	18	(2)	39	31	30	(15)
5. Job prestige	60	33	7	(4)	55	38	7	(16)
6. Work load (amount of hours)	61	20	19	(4)	45	29	26	(15)
7. Policy of board of trustees	43	35	21	(4)	32	40	28	(15)
8. Policies of state governing agencies	21	45	34	(6)	16	47	38	(17)
9. Opportunity for attending professional meetings	51	30	19	(4)	46	34	20	(16)
10. School-community relationships	53	33	14	(4)	50	37	13	(16)
11. Relationship with administrators	60	25	15	(3)	33	41	27	(14)
12. Class size	63	18	19	(4)	42	30	28	(15)
13. Quality of students	32	43	25	(3)	19	46	35	(15)
14. Attitudes of students and behavior	50	33	17	(3)	34	44	23	(15)
15. Facilities	56	19	25	(3)	48	26	26	(15)
16. Relationship with academic faculty	70	24	6	(4)	65	28	7	(15)
17. Relationship with vocational faculty	66	29	5	(7)	59	35	6	(18)

	(a) Your feelings				(b) Your colleagues' feelings			
	1	2	3	N.A.	1	2	3	N.A.
18. Library facilities	69	19	13	(3)	63	24	14	(15)
19. Other	23	10	67	(96)	13	23	61	(96)

36. AT WHAT TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION WOULD YOU MOST PREFER EMPLOYMENT? (Please check only one.)

1. 0 Elementary School
2. 1 High School
3. 62 Public Junior College
4. 2 Private Junior College
5. 1 Public Teachers College
6. 0 Private Teachers College
7. 9 Public Four-year College
8. 6 Private Four-year College
9. 9 Public University
10. 5 Private University
11. 4 Other (Please specify: ____________________)

(5)

37. HAVE YOU HAD WORK EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION PRIOR TO YOUR CURRENT POSITION?

1. 77 Yes 2. 23 No (1) N.A.

IF YES, WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS YOU WERE EMPLOYED IN EACH TYPE OF POSITION INDICATED AT EACH TYPE OF INSTITUTION LISTED.

(See page 13a)

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	POSITION		
	Faculty	Counselor	Administrator
1. Elementary	____	____	____
2. Secondary	____	____	____
3. Public Junior College	____	____	____
4. Private Junior College	____	____	____
5. Public Teachers College	____	____	____
6. Private Teachers College	____	____	____
7. Public Four-year College	____	____	____
8. Private Four-year College	____	____	____
9. Public University	____	____	____
10. Private University	____	____	____
11. Other (Please specify: ____________________)	____	____	____
12. Does not apply	____	____	____

37. IF YES, WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS YOU WERE EMPLOYED IN EACH TYPE OF POSITION INDICATED AT EACH TYPE OF INSTITUTION LISTED.

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	POSITION		
	Faculty	Counselor	Administrator
1. Elementary	0 - 88% (25)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 98% (24)
2. Secondary	0 - 45% 1-10 - 47 10 - 9 (7)	0 - 98% (24)	0 - 96% (24)
3. Public junior college	0 - 84% (26)	1 - 100% (24)	0 - 98% (24)
4. Private junior college	0 - 97% (24)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 100% (24)
5. Public teachers college	0 - 98% (24)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 100% (24)
6. Private teachers college	0 - 100% (2)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 100% (24)
7. Public four-year college	0 - 92% (25)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 100% (24)
8. Private four-year college	0 - 92% (25)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 99% (24)
9. Public university	0 - 87% (26)	0 - 99% (24)	0 - 99% (24)
10. Private university	0 - 94% (25)	0 - 100% (24)	0 - 99% (24)
11. Other	0 - 85% (29)	0 - 99% (24)	0 - 96% (25)

38. PLEASE INDICATE THE LENGTH OF YOUR EMPLOYMENT IN THE OCCUPATION(S) OUTSIDE OF EDUCATION LISTED BELOW. (Please check all that apply)

OCCUPATION	1-3 Yrs.	3-10 Yrs.	10+ Yrs.	Does not Apply /NA
1. General worker (such as custodian, farm laborer, general and domestic laborer)	85	11	4	(84)
2. Semi-skilled worker (such as machine operator, retail clerk, waitress, truck driver, mail carrier, barber)	81	18	2	(77)
3. Skilled clerical or sales (such as bookkeeper, sales representative, secretary)	71	20	9	(75)
4. Skilled craftsman or foreman (such as electrician, baker, carpenter, bricklayer, factory foreman)	27	28	45	(85)
5. Protective service worker (such as policeman, military, fireman)	44	29	26	(90)
6. Owner or manager of small business or firm (such as insurance – real estate agent, store proprietor, contractor)	46	25	29	(89)
7. Farm owner or manager	47	41	12	(97)
8. Semi-professional or technician (such as programmer, lab technician)	47	31	22	(84)
9. Managerial and professional I (such as bank manager, public administrator, clergyman, school teacher, engineer, certified public accountant)	37	29	35	(68)
10. Managerial and professional II (such as physician, professor, lawyer)	27	36	37	(91)
11. Housewife	25	28	47	(87)
12. Unemployed	76	14	10	(97)

YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

39. IN YOUR OPINION, HOW DO MOST OF THE STUDENTS AT THIS INSTITUTION COMPARE WITH COLLEGE STUDENTS IN GENERAL ON THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS? (Please check each item in the appropriate column.)

	Below Average	Average	Above Average	NA
1. Academic background	62	37	1	(2)
2. Leadership ability	36	62	3	(3)
3. Understanding of others	13	75	13	(4)
4. Intelligence	25	73	2	(2)
5. Social skills	32	64	4	(3)
6. Drive to succeed	32	51	17	(3)
7. Study habits	65	33	2	(3)
8. Political interest	33	57	11	(4)
9. Interest in social activities	29	63	8	(3)
10. Emotional adjustment	15	79	6	(3)
11. Self-confidence (academic)	52	46	2	(3)
12. Self-confidence (social)	20	74	6	(4)
13. Maturity	23	65	12	(3)
14. Interest in school	34	54	12	(3)
15. Awareness of political-social events	30	58	12	(3)

40. (A) IN YOUR OPINION, TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK THE STUDENTS AT THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE (a) *PRESENTLY DO* AND (b) *SHOULD* RECEIVE THE FOLLOWING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS? (Please check the appropriate column in section (a) do receive and (b) should receive.)

	(a) DO RECEIVE				(b) SHOULD RECEIVE			
	Very much	Some	Little/ none	N.A.	Very much	Some	Little/ none	N.A.
1. Vocational training (skills and techniques directly applicable to job)	60	37	3	(3)	78	21	2	(14)
2. Background and specialization for further education in some professional scientific or scholarly field	36	55	9	(5)	50	46	4	(13)
3. Broadened literary acquaintance and appreciation	17	68	14	(7)	40	57	3	(14)
4. Awareness of different philosophies, cultures and ways of life	25	60	15	(5)	54	42	3	(13)
5. Social development (experience and skill in relating to other people)	19	67	14	(6)	58	41	2	(13)
6. Personal development (understanding one's abilities and limitations, interests and standards of behavior)	23	60	18	(6)	71	28	1	(13)
7. Critical thinking (logic, inference, nature and limitations of knowledge)	11	65	24	(6)	64	35	1	(12)
8. Aesthetic sensitivity (appreciation and enjoyment of art, music, drama)	11	62	27	(6)	40	56	4	(13)
9. Writing and speaking skills (clear, correct, effective communication)	24	64	12	(5)	79	20	0	(12)
10. Science and technology (understanding and appreciation)	23	68	9	(5)	46	53	1	(14)
11. Citizenship (understanding and interest in the style and quality of civic and political life)	14	71	15	(5)	52	46	2	(14)

Most important		(a) DO RECEIVE Very much	Some	Little none	(b) SHOULD RECEIVE Very much	Some	Little none	N.A.
6	12. Appreciation of individuality and independence of thought and action	20	64	15(6)	60	39	1	(13)
0	13. Development of friendships and loyalties of lasting value	14	64	22(7)	35	60	5	(14)
0	14. Vocabulary, terminology and facts in various fields of knowledge	26	64	11(6)	53	46	1	(14)
2	15. Appreciation of religion (moral and ethical standards)	4	42	54(7)	24	59	18	(13)
14	16. Tolerance and understanding of other people and their values	18	66	16(6)	66	33	1	(13)
8	17. Basis for improved social and economic status	22	68	10(7)	56	42	1	(15)
(25)								

(B) NOW, PLEASE CIRCLE THE *ONE BENEFIT* LISTED ABOVE WHICH YOU THINK IS MOST IMPORTANT FOR THE STUDENTS AT YOUR COLLEGE TO RECEIVE.

(See page 17a)

11. IN YOUR OPINION, TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE EXERT CONTROL OVER THE FOLLOWING STUDENT BEHAVIORS? (Please check each item.)

	Considerable	Moderate	Little	N.A.
1. Dress and grooming standards	8	38	55	(2)
2. Speech (profanity)	30	41	29	(2)
3. Expressive art and music	7	40	53	(3)
4. Student publication of newspaper	11	50	39	(2)
5. Student speaker's program selections	13	50	37	(2)
6. On-campus political organizations	16	50	34	(3)
7. Campus student protest	30	47	23	(2)
8. Student housing arrangements	17	31	52	(14)

40(b). PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE BENEFIT LISTED ABOVE WHICH YOU THINK IS MOST IMPORTANT FOR THE STUDENTS AT YOUR COLLEGE TO RECEIVE.

Benefit	% response
1	18%
2	5
4	4
5	2
6	23
7	10
8	1
9	6
10	1
11	1
12	6
15	2
16	14
17	8
	(25)

42. WHICH ARE THE THREE *MOST* IMPORTANT QUALIFICATIONS YOU THINK A JUNIOR COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR SHOULD HAVE? (Please mark "1" for most important, "2" for next important, and "3" for third most important.)

I	II		III
10	11	1. _____ Teaching experience at the elementary or secondary level	13
20	23	2. _____ Teaching experience at the junior college level	28
2	6	3. _____ Teaching experience at a four-year institution	7
9	9	4. _____ Outstanding undergraduate/graduate academic record	15
53	40	5. _____ Demonstrated interest in student problems and activities	25
5	12	6. _____ Demonstrated scholarly work	12
15	19	7. _____ Wide range of work experience other than teaching	18
(20)	(16)	8. _____ Other (Please specify: ____________________)	(22)

43. WHICH GROUP DO YOU THINK SHOULD HAVE THE PRIMARY AND WHICH THE SECONDARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (For each activity write a "1" under the group you think should have primary responsibility, a "2" under the group that should have some responsibility and "0" for no responsibility. Please write a number in each column for each activity. You may use the same number more than once.)

(See page 19a)

	Faculty	Adminis-tration	Trustees or govern-ing board	Students
1. Student admissions	______	______	______	______
2. Degree Requirements and curriculum development	______	______	______	______
3. Hiring of faculty and counselors	______	______	______	______
4. Administrative selection (other than president)	______	______	______	______
5. Selection of president	______	______	______	______
6. Administrative evaluation	______	______	______	______
7. Faculty teaching evaluation	______	______	______	______
8. Student conduct	______	______	______	______
9. Salaries, budget and resource allocation	______	______	______	______
10. Teaching assignments	______	______	______	______
11. Selection of departmental chairman	______	______	______	______
12. Other (Please specify: ____________________)	______	______	______	______

43. WHICH GROUP DO YOU THINK SHOULD HAVE THE PRIMARY AND WHICH THE SECONDARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (For each activity write a "1" under the group you think should have primary responsibility, a "2" under the group that should have some responsibility and "0" for no responsibility.)

	Faculty				Administration				Trustees or governing board				Students			
	0	1	2	N.A.	0	1	2	N.A.	0	1	2	N.A.	0	1	2	N.A.
1. Student admissions	12	26	62	(12)	3	77	21	(7)	44	20	36	(21)	66	7	28	(21)
2. Degree requirements and curriculum development	1	72	27	(7)	5	47	49	(9)	42	17	42	(20)	41	7	52	(20)
3. Hiring of faculty and counselors	11	42	47	(13)	2	75	23	(6)	32	19	48	(18)	67	5	28	(20)
4. Administrative selection (other than president)	12	39	49	(13)	5	59	36	(11)	16	49	35	(13)	66	6	28	(20)
5. Selection of president	12	43	45	(13)	4	34	52	(15)	5	78	17	(9)	55	13	32	(19)
6. Administrative evaluation	3	63	33	(9)	23	37	40	(18)	16	54	34	(13)	43	13	44	(21)
7. Faculty teaching evaluation	8	60	33	(11)	6	52	42	(10)	68	8	24	(20)	15	38	47	(14)
8. Student conduct	7	41	52	(11)	8	55	37	(11)	47	14	39	(22)	8	58	33	(12)
9. Salaries, budget budget and resource allocation	8	34	54	(16)	2	70	28	(7)	5	62	32	(13)	79	3	18	(21)
10. Teaching assignments	2	62	36	(7)	4	65	32	(6)	73	3	24	(22)	86	2	13	(21)
11. Selection of department chairman	3	75	22	(6)	13	42	45	(8)	72	6	23	(22)	90	1	9	(21)
12. Other	27	46	27	(99)	36	46	18	(99)	70	20	10	(99)	46	18	36	(99)

44. ASSUMING LIMITED RESOURCES, WHAT IN YOUR OPINION ARE THE TWO MOST AND THE TWO LEAST IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES OF YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE (a) AT PRESENT, AND (b) FOR THE FUTURE. (In both columns mark "1" for the two *most* important, and "2" for the two *least* important priorities.)

(See page 20a)	(a) Present	(b) Future
1. General education for transfer to a four-year institution		
2. Preparation in a specific subject field for transfer to a four-year institution		
3. Continuing education (college credit)		
4. Adult education (non-college credit)		
5. Remedial and "high potential" programs for disadvantaged students		
6. Special occupational programs for local business and industry		
7. Occupational programs leading to a certificate or associate degree		
8. Other (please specify: ______)		

44. ASSUMING LIMITED RESOURCES, WHAT IN YOUR OPINION ARE THE TWO MOST AND THE TWO LEAST IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES OF YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE (a) AT PRESENT, AND (b) FOR THE FUTURE? (In both columns mark "1" for the two most important, and "2" for the two least important priorities.)

	(a) Present				(b) Future			
	Most		Least		Most		Least	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
1. General education for transfer to a four-year institution	60	1	19	0	52	0	22	0
2. Preparation in a specific subject field for transfer to a four-year institution	9	17	35	15	10	9	36	17
3. Continuing education (college credit)	6	16	11	10	9	11	11	11
4. Adult education (non-college credit)	2	9	19	25	3	8	17	27
5. Remedial and "high potential" programs for disadvantaged students	12	25	8	18	14	30	8	15
6. Special occupational programs for local business and industry	12	33	8	32	12	42	6	30
7. Occupational programs leading to a certificate or associate degree	4	43	2	8	5	37	2	7
8. Other	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1
N.A.	(12)	(26)	(18)	(35)	(18)	(32)	(19)	(35)

45. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGE SYSTEM? (Check in column "a" what you expect to occur and in column "b" what you would *like* to see occur. Check as many as apply.)

	(a) Expect to occur NA	**(b) Would like to see occur** NA
1. Conversion of most two-year colleges to four-year colleges	8 (2)	9 (3)
2. Assume all lower division responsibilities from present four-year institutions	40 (2)	40 (3)
3. Move occupational programs to technical institutions	14 (2)	22 (3)
4. Move secondary level occupational programs to area vocational schools	14 (2)	23 (3)
5. Expand continuing education	47 (2)	57 (3)
6. Expand occupational education program	58 (2)	59 (3)
7. Continue operation of the junior colleges essentially as they are	42 (2)	20 (3)
8. Other (Please specify: ______________________)	2 (2)	3 (3)

46. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT BENEFITS YOU FEEL THE COMMUNITY IS (a) PRESENTLY RECEIVING FROM THIS COLLEGE, AND (b) SHOULD IDEALLY RECEIVE? (For both "present" and "ideal" check "1" for most important, "2" for next most important and "3" for third most important.) .

(See page 22a)	**(a) Present**	**(b) Ideal**
1. Training of skilled personnel to fill manpower needs of local industry	________	________
2. Allowing undecided students an opportunity to explore alternative educational/vocational paths	________	________
3. Raising the intellectual and cultural level of the community	________	________
4. Developing talents and abilities of adults	________	________
5. Providing facilities for community use	________	________
6. Offering exposure to higher education to students who, for financial reasons, would not otherwise have had such an opportunity	________	________
7. Upgrading of skills or retraining for adults	________	________
8. Source of pride and identification for local community due to academic, athletics, vocational training, etc.	________	________
9. Attracting or holding significant business and industry to the community	________	________
10. Assisting in the development of the community	________	________
11. I don't know enough about the community to give an opinion	________	________
12. Other (Please specify: ________________________________)	________	________

46. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT BENEFITS YOU FEEL THE COMMUNITY IS (a) PRESENTLY RECEIVING FROM THIS COLLEGE, AND (b) SHOULD IDEALLY RECEIVE? (For both "present" and "ideal" check "1" for most important, "2" for next most important and "3" for third most important.)

	(a) Present			(b) Ideal		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
1. Training of skilled personnel to fill manpower needs of local industry	20	12	20	21	11	16
2. Allowing undecided students an opportunity to explore alternative educational/vocational paths	24	33	15	20	26	16
3. Raising the intellectual and cultural level of the community	4	8	14	12	13	15
4. Developing talents and abilities of adults	1	8	15	2	6	14
5. Providing facilities for community use	0	1	5	0	2	2
6. Offering exposure to higher education to students who, for financial reasons, would not otherwise have had such an opportunity	45	26	10	37	25	11
7. Upgrading of skills or retraining for adults	0	8	11	1	10	10
8. Source of pride and identification for local community due to academic, athletics, etc.	2	1	5	1	2	4
9. Attracting or holding significant business and industry to the community	0	5	2	.4	1	3
10. Assisting in the development of the community	1	1	2	3	1	3
11. I don't know enough about the community to give an opinion	1	3	5	1	4	9
12. Other	1	0	0	1	0	0
N.A.	(18)	(20)	(21)	(23)	(24)	(26)

47. IN WHAT ACTIVITIES HAVE YOU ENGAGED DURING THE PAST YEAR IN THE COMMUNITY SERVED BY THIS COLLEGE? (Please check each item applicable.)

1. 82 I talked about local community problems with my friends
2. 87 I followed local events regularly in my newspaper
3. 81 I gave money to the community fund or chest or other local charity
4. 56 I belonged to a community interested in civic affairs (such as PTA, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, business or professional association, etc.)
5. 38 I attended meetings of some local civic group
6. 47 I contributed time or money to some civic project (such as a playground, park, school, hospital, theater, etc.)
7. 34 I had contact with a local official about some community problem
8. 28 I collected money, called on my neighbors, carried a petition, or engaged in some similar activity on behalf of a local community project
9. 86 I voted in the last local election
10. 37 I attended a public hearing about a local issue (such as zoning, schools, taxes, traffic, etc.)
11. 10 I participated in a demonstration or protest about a local issue
12. 22 I held office in some local civic group or community organization
13. 8 Other (Please specify: ________________)
14. (5) Does not apply /NA

48. IN YOUR OPINION, BASED ON WHAT YOU THINK IS DESIRABLE, WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF YOUR COLLEGE'S STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAM. (Please mark each item.)

	Strong	Average	Weak	N.A.
1. Admissions and registration	32	51	17	(5)
2. Records and information	34	56	10	(5)
3. Guidance and academic counseling	23	48	29	(5)
4. Guidance and vocational counseling	26	44	30	(19)
5. Placement for work	19	48	33	(8)
6. Financial aids	32	51	17	(6)
7. Student activities	14	58	29	(6)
8. Special counseling for disadvantaged students	31	46	23	(6)
9. Special counseling for students with academic problems	21	48	32	(7)

49. RECOGNIZING THAT FACILITIES, PROCEDURES, POLICIES, REQUIREMENTS, ATTITUDES, ETC., DIFFER FROM ONE CAMPUS TO ANOTHER, WHAT DO YOU THINK IS CHARACTERISTIC OF YOUR CAMPUS? AS YOU READ EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW, CHECK TRUE (T), IF THE STATEMENT DESCRIBES A CONDITION, EVENT, ATTITUDE, ETC., THAT YOU THINK IS GENERALLY CHARACTERISTIC OF YOUR COLLEGE. CHECK FALSE (F) IF YOU THINK IT IS NOT GENERALLY CHARACTERISTIC OF YOUR COLLEGE.

	Generally		
	T	F	NA
1. Frequent tests are given in most courses	78	22	(4)
2. The college offers many really practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc.	91	10	(3)
3. The most important people at the school expect others to show proper respect for them	54	46	(8)
4. There is a recognized group of student leaders on the campus	41	60	(6)
5. Many upperclassmen play an active role in helping new students adjust to campus life	22	78	(8)
6. The professors go out of their way to help their students	88	12	(4)
7. The school has a reputation for being friendly	85	15	(6)
8. Students find it easy to get a group together for card games, singing, going to the movies, etc.	53	47	(12)
9. Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices	54	46	(8)
10. The school offers many opportunities for students to understand and criticize important works in art, music, and drama	41	59	(7)
11. Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs	37	63	(8)
12. Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussions	31	69	(5)
13. Students are conscientious about taking good care of school property	39	61	(6)
14. Students are expected to report any violation of rules and regulations	24	76	(9)
15. Students ask permission before deviating from common policies or practices	35	65	(9)
16. Student publications never lampoon dignified people or institutions	27	73	(7)
17. Most courses provide a real intellectual challenge	60	40	(8)

	Generally T	F	N.A.
18. Students set high standards of achievement for themselves	22	78	(8)
19. Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class	48	52	(9)
20. Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading student papers, reports, or discussions	65	35	(12)

50. WHAT TYPE OF COLLEGE WOULD YOU PREFER YOUR CHILDREN TO ATTEND FOR THE FIRST TWO YEARS IF ADMISSION AND FINANCES WERE NO CONSIDERATION? (Please indicate your first, second and third choices by writing 1, 2, 3.)

	I	II	III
1. ______ Public Junior College	31	13	11
2. ______ Private Junior College	4	5	5
3. ______ Public Teachers College	0	2	3
4. ______ Private Teachers College	0	1	2
5. ______ Public Four-year College	6	24	19
6. ______ Private Four-year College	19	18	12
7. ______ Public University	12	22	28
8. ______ Private University	17	16	15
9. ______ Other (Please specify: ______)	3	1	1
10. ______ It would not make any difference.	7	0	3
	(5)	(47)	(49)

51. (A) ALL OF US HAVE DIFFERENT PREFERENCES AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS. WE SHOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP OF DIFFERENT CHOICES AND TRAITS TO IMPORTANT COLLEGE AND SUBSEQUENT CAREER EXPERIENCES. (Please mark "yes" for all the items you generally like; "no" for those you do not generally like.)

I generally like:	Yes	No
1. Unquestioning obedience	16 (5)	
2. Strict law enforcement	62 (7)	
3. The tried and true	43 (9)	
4. Determination and ambition	97 (4)	
5. Strong family ties	81 (6)	
6. Unwavering patriotism	41 (8)	
7. Perfect balance in composition	38 (13)	
8. Novel experiences	87 (7)	
9. Predictable outcomes to problems	46 (10)	
10. Original work	97 (4)	
11. A set schedule of activities	54 (6)	
12. A proper place for everything	66 (6)	
13. The one right answer to questions	18 (8)	
14. Friends without complex problems	39 (9)	
15. Straight-forward reasoning	92 (6)	
16. Dealing with new or strange ideas	89 (5)	
17. The perfectly completed object	49 (13)	
18. Quick and certain decisions	34 (8)	
19. Original research work	85 (7)	
20. To draw ~~my own conclusions~~	97 (4)	
21. Solving long, complex problems	56 (7)	
22. Critical consideration of theory	82 (7)	
23. Science and mathematics	59 (7)	
24. Contemplating the future of society	78 (7)	
25. Men interested in ideas	97 (4)	
26. Discovering how things work	86 (5)	
27. Scientific displays	64 (8)	
28. Detecting faulty reasoning	83 (8)	

(B) (Please mark "yes" for those adjectives that you think are generally descriptive of you; "no" for those that are not.)

I generally am:	**Yes**	**No**
1. Well-organized	74 (4)	
2. Practical	91 (3)	
3. Individualistic	89 (4)	
4. Questioning	91 (4)	
5. Predictable	53 (5)	
6. Open-minded	95 (4)	
7. Introspective	80 (6)	
8. Experimental	81 (4)	
9. Creative	72 (6)	
10. Undistracted	32 (6)	
11. Analytical	81 (5)	
12. Critical-minded	80 (4)	
13. Scientific	53 (6)	
14. Sociable	81 (5)	
15. Contemplative	84 (5)	
16. Dutiful	84 (5)	
17. Determined	91 (4)	
18. Conventional	59 (7)	
19. Unrestrained	25 (6)	
20. Adaptable	95 (4)	
21. Permissive	59 (7)	
22. Worried	28 (7)	
23. Happy	89 (7)	
24. Calm	79 (7)	
25. Self-confident	88 (5)	
26. Nervous	24 (6)	
27. Anxious	31 (6)	
28. Restless	36 (6)	

52. THE STATEMENTS BELOW EXPRESS VIEWPOINTS THAT SOME PEOPLE AGREE WITH AND OTHERS DON'T. (Indicate your own attitude by marking one of the spaces to the right of each statement. A = Agree, ? = No Opinion, D = Disagree.)

	A	?	D	NA
1. Government planning should be strictly limited, for it almost inevitably results in the loss of essential liberty and freedom.	35	21	45	(4)
2. We are not likely to have lasting peace unless the U.S. and its allies are stronger than all the other countries.	29	18	53	(4)
3. The United Nations should have the right to make decisions that would bind members to a course of action.	56	18	26	(4)
4. Literature should not question the basic moral concepts of society.	7	11	82	(4)
5. The United States has enough natural resources and scientific know-how to be economically self-sufficient.	31	11	59	(4)
6. Parents know as much about how to teach children as public school teachers know.	6	11	83	(3)
7. More women should be involved in policy formation both in business and government.	71	16	13	(3)
8. Professional women should have the same benefits and opportunities as their male colleagues.	94	2	4	(3)
9. Being a housewife provides many opportunities to apply broad and creative interests.	52	17	32	(4)
10. Family patterns and attitudes should allow, and often encourage, married women to follow their own interests, even if they have young children.	79	9	12	(4)
11. If Negroes live poorly, it is in great part the fault of discrimination and neglect from whites.	52	17	31	(4)
12. Anyone, no matter what his color, who is willing to work hard can get ahead in life.	53	9	39	(4)
13. More money and effort should be spent on education, welfare and self-help programs for the culturally disadvantaged.	67	14	19	(5)
14. Issues such as law and order, civil rights and public demonstrations are complex and need careful evaluation and judgment of individual cases.	88	7	5	(4)

	A	?	D	N.A.
15. People who advocate unpopular or extreme ideas should be allowed to speak on college campuses if the students want to hear them.	69	13	18	(5)

53. WE WOULD APPRECIATE A BRIEF NOTE ON THE REACTIONS YOU HAVE TO THIS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE OR TO THE PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY GENERALLY.

TABLES TO CHAPTER 6

TABLE 6-1

F RATIOS AND EXTREME INSTITUTIONAL MEAN STANDARD FACTOR SCORES OF FACULTY MEMBERS' VIEWPOINTS ON SOCIAL ISSUES

Scale	F ratio	Range of means	Institutions with extreme negative means	Institutions with extreme positive means
Restriction of civil rights	6.44	-1.02 to .49	Manning -1.02 Foster - .44 Quanto - .40	Lowell .49 Palmerston .45 Shaw .45
Restriction of women's rights	2.60	-.46 to .67	Manning -.46 Foster -.34 Sherwood -.26	Ward .67 Lowell .32 Palmerston .29
Restriction of government	3.45	-.31 to .42	Walden -.31 Shaw -.29 Quanto -.29	Meade .42 Sherwood .40 Langston .34

TABLE 6-2

THE FACULTY'S PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES AND LENGTH OF SERVICE PRIOR TO THEIR CURRENT POSITION*

Type of institution where employed		Type and years of service											
		Teaching				Counseling				Administration			
		1-5	6-10	10	Total	1-5	6-10	>10	Total	1-5	6-10	>10	Total
Elementary school	(N)	(52)	(13)	(4)	(69)	(2)	-	-	(2)	(8)	(1)	(1)	(10)
	%	9.4	2.4	.8	12.6	.4			.4	1.5	.2	.2	1.9
Secondary school	(N)	(169)	(75)	(46)	(290)	(10)	(2)	-	(12)	(12)	(8)	(3)	(23)
	%	32.0	14.0	9.0	55.0	1.8	.4		2.2	2.1	1.5	.6	4.2
Public junior college	(N)	(75)	(9)	(5)	(89)	(2)	(1)	-	.2	-	-	-	-
	%	13.6	1.7	1.0	16.3	.4	.2						
Private junior college	(N)	(15)	(2)	-	(17)	(1)	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	-
	%	2.8	.4		3.2	.2			.2				
Total junior college	(N)	(90)	(11)	(5)	(106)	(3)	(1)	-	(4)	(11)	-	(1)	(12)
	%	16.4	2.1	1.0	19.5	.6	.2		.8	2.1		.2	2.3
Public teachers' college	(N)	(6)	(4)	-	(10)	-	-	-	-	(1)	-	-	(1)
	%	1.1	.8		1.9					.2			.2
Public 4-year college	(N)	(40)	(1)	(1)	(42)	-	-	-	-	(1)	-	-	(1)
	%	7.2	.2	.2	7.6					.2			.2
Private 4-year college	(N)	(41)	(2)	-	(43)	-	-	-	-	(4)	-	-	(4)
	%	7.3	.4		7.7					.8			.8
Total 4-year college	(N)	(87)	(7)	(1)	(95)	-	-	-	-	(6)	-	-	(6)
	%	15.6	1.4	.2	17.2					1.2			1.2
Public university	(N)	(63)	(4)	(4)	(71)	(3)	(1)	-	(4)	(5)	-	(1)	(6)
	%	11.5	.8	.8	13.1	.6	.2		.8	1.0		.2	1.2
Private university	(N)	(25)	(4)	(3)	(32)	(1)	-	(1)	(2)	(2)	-	(2)	(4)
	%	4.4	.8	.6	5.8	.2		.2	.4	.4		.4	.8
Total university	(N)	(88)	(8)	(7)	(103)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(6)	(7)	-	(3)	(10)
	%	15.9	1.6	1.4	18.9	.8	.2	.2	1.2	1.4		.6	.2
Other	(N)	(55)	(15)	(8)	(78)	(4)	-	(1)	(5)	(19)	(2)	(2)	(23)
	%	9.3	2.9	1.8	14.0	8		.2	1.0	3.5	.4	.4	4.3

*Percentages are based on the 569 faculty members who reported prior experiences.

TABLE 6-3

F RATIOS AND EXTREME INSTITUTIONAL MEAN STANDARD FACTOR SCORES OF FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR COLLEGE ENVIRONMENTS

Scale	F ratio	Range of means	Institutions with extreme negative means		Institutions with extreme positive means	
Awareness	3.50	-.81 to 1.03	Palmerston	-.81	Manning	1.03
			Lowell	-.33	Sherwood	.38
			Langston	-.19	Walden	.23
Propriety	14.83	-.87 to 1.40	Foster	-.87	Palmerston	1.40
			Langston	-.86	Kinsey	.94
			Sherwood	-.58	Shaw	.58
Community	5.59	-.71 to .58	Foster	-.71	Manning	.58
			Walden	-.40	Newson	.57
			Langston	-.31	Quanto	.55
Scholarship	9.07	-1.06 to .58	Langston	-.06	Shaw	.58
			Walden	-.44	Ward	.40
			Sherwood	-.38	Meade	.27
Student benefits	7.40	-1.50 to .76	Ward	-1.50	Sherwood	.76
			Lowell	- .40	Kinsey	.51
			Walden	- .21	Carter	.35
Institutional rigidity	9.06	-.62 to .99	Langston	-.62	Manning	.99
			Sherwood	-.58	Lowell	.79
			Kinsey	-.47	Palmerston	.54

TABLE 6-4

F RATIOS AND EXTREME INSTITUTIONAL MEAN STANDARD FACTOR SCORES OF FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT BENEFITS THEIR STUDENTS DO AND SHOULD RECEIVE

Scale for do and should receive	F ratio	Range of means	Institutions with extreme negative means	Institutions with extreme positive means
Personal and social development				
Do receive	6.35	-.52 to 1.02	Langston -.52	Sherwood 1.02
			Ward -.43	Manning .32
			Walden -.36	Carter .10
Should receive	2.78	-.51 to .31	Lowell -.51	Foster .31
			Palmerston -.38	Sherwood .29
			Appleton -.24	Langston .25
Academic development				
Do receive	6.92	-1.06 to .58	Palmerston -1.06	Sherwood .58
			Lowell - .71	Meade .38
			Langston - .31	Kinsey/Shaw .29
Should receive	4.61	-.97 to .67	Palmerston -.97	Manning .67
			Lowell -.68	Meade .36
			Newson -.31	Foster .22
Vocational development				
Do receive	4.67	-.47 to .66	Manning -.47	Palmerston .66
			Walden -.45	Lowell .45
			Sherwood -.41	Newson .30
Should receive	3.17	-.52 to .38	Walden -.52	Kinsey .38
			Ward -.47	Manning .35
			Appleton -.34	Lowell .30

TABLE 6-5

F RATIOS AND EXTREME INSTITUTIONAL MEAN STANDARD FACTOR SCORES OF FACULTY MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR STUDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Scale	F ratio	Range of means	Institutions with extreme negative means		Institutions with extreme positive means	
Academic potential	5.68	-.76 to .70	Palmerston	-.76	Newson	.70
			Manning	-.72	Meade	.42
			Walden	-.32	Carter	.41
Maturity and drive	3.91	-.66 to .72	Palmerston	-.66	Manning	.72
			Walden	-.42	Lowell	.39
			Quanto	-.39	Sherwood	.29
Political orientation	7.86	-.95 to 1.28	Palmerston	-.95	Manning	1.28
			Quanto	-.50	Langston	.80
			Ward	-.34	Foster	.26
Sociability	3.29	-.85 to .39	Palmerston	-.85	Appleton	.39
			Foster	-.52	Manning	.30
			Walden	-.15	Meade	.28

TABLE 6-6

AMOUNT OF RESPONSIBILITY THE MAJORITY OF FACULTY CONSIDERED EACH CONSTITUENT GROUP SHOULD HAVE FOR EACH SPECIFIED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITY*

Activity	Group and degree of responsibility											
	Faculty			Administration			Trustees			Students		
	None	Prime	Sec	None	Prime	Sec	None	Prime	Sec	None	Prime	Sec
Student admissions			X		X					X		
Degree requirements		X										X
Faculty hiring					X					X		
Administrator hiring					X					X		
President hiring						X		X		X		
Administrative evaluation												
Faculty evaluation		X			X		X					
Student conduct			X		X						X	
Budget			X		X			X		X		
Teaching assignments		X					X			X		
Department chairman selection		X					X			X		

*Each "X" signifies a majority faculty response.

APPENDIX E

COUNSELOR MARGINAL DATA
AND
TABLE TO CHAPTER 7

356/357

O.M.B. No. 51-S71038E
APPROVAL EXPIRES 6-30-72

THE STUDY OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE

MARGINALS and

% MISSING OBSERVATIONS (IN PARENTHESES)

Center for the Study of Evaluation
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Office of Education Contract No. 0-70-4795

OE FORM 2337-1, 11/71

Dear Colleague:

You have been randomly chosen to participate in a nationwide study of a select group of approximately 15 community colleges. The study is being undertaken by the Higher Education Project of U.C.L.A.'s Center for the Study of Evaluation under contract to the National Center for Educational Statistics of the Office of Education. This study is designed to provide the Office of Education with empirically based suggestions for more effective development of the community or two-year colleges.

By taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire you will be making a significant contribution toward bridging the gap between action at the federal level and real needs at the institutional level.

Be assured that your responses to this questionnaire, as well as those of your colleagues, will be analyzed in a statistical sense only and that your anonymity will be absolutely protected by your following the directions listed below:

1. Do not write your name on this booklet.
2. When you have completed this questionnaire, please write your name and school in the space provided on the attached postcard (on the left).
3. Detach the postcard and return it in a mailing separate from the questionnaire.

This procedure allows us to know who has not returned the questionnaire while preserving the strict anonymity of the questionnaire respondents themselves. We will then be able to send follow-up requests to the nonrespondents. At no time will your responses be seen by anyone from your institution.

We will be very grateful if you would complete and return this questionnaire to us within 5 days. We thank you in advance for the time taken from your busy schedule to complete this questionnaire.

Very sincerely,

James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

INSTRUCTIONS: This questionnaire is about the counseling services in your college. We hope that you will respond to all of the items, but feel free to skip any item you prefer not to answer.

1. WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE WHERE YOU ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED? ______

2. HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK ON THE AVERAGE DO YOU SPEND IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (Please enter the hours you spend weekly in each of the following appropriate activities) (See page 1a)

   1. ______ Meetings
   2. ______ Counseling
   3. ______ Research
   4. ______ Teaching
   5. ______ Other activities at the institution (Please specify: ______)

3. IF YOU ARE INVOLVED IN RESEARCH OF ANY KIND, PLEASE EXPLAIN IT BRIEFLY:

   1. Testing - 24; Student characteristics - 15; Counseling techniques - 15; Special programs - 12; Other - 35; (66)
   2. ______ Does not apply

4. DO COUNSELORS AT YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE PARTICIPATE IN PLANNING CURRICULUM AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT?

   1. 15 Yes, a great deal
   2. 53 Yes, sometimes
   3. 32 No

   (3)

5. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE COUNSELORS AT YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE FREE TO PLAN THEIR OWN SCHEDULES?

   1. 57 Very much
   2. 33 Some
   3. 10 Very little

   (1)

*Parentheses indicate missing data.

2. HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK ON THE AVERAGE DO YOU SPEND IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (Please enter the hours you spend weekly in each of the following appropriate activities)

1. Meetings:
0 hours - 1% response
1 - 11
2 - 24
3 - 19
4 - 19
5 - 14
6 - 7
9 - 1
10 - 3
15 - 1
(6)

2. Counseling:
0 hours - 2% response
1 - 1
2 - 2
3 - 1
4 - 1
5 - 2
6 - 3
8 - 1
10 - 7
13 - 2
15 - 4%
17 - 1
19 - 1
20 - 11
22 - 3
23 - 3
24 - 1
25 - 10
26 - 2
27 - 5
28 - 4%
29 1
30 16
31 1
32 1
33 2
34 3
35 4
36 2
(5)

3. Research:
0 hours - 59% response
1 - 11
2 12
3 8
4 1
5 3
7 1
10 5
(0)

4. Teaching:
0 hours - 40% response
1 3
2 9
3 7
4 9
5 1
6 10
8 4
9 4
10 3
12 - 3%
13 - 1
15 - 3
18 - 1
(30)

5. Other activities:
0 hours - 29% response
1 - 8
2 - 8
3 - 4
4 - 4
5 - 1
6 - 8
7 - 1
8 - 4
9 - 1
10 - 3%
13 - 1
14 - 3
15 - 5
18 - 1
20 - 8
24 - 3
25 - 1
30 - 4
31 - 1
(20)

6. DO COUNSELORS AT YOUR JUNIOR COLLEGE HAVE SYSTEMATIC FEEDBACK FROM FACULTY, STUDENTS AND ADMINISTRATORS CONCERNING HOW WELL THEY ARE PERFORMING THEIR FUNCTIONS? (Please check for faculty, students and administrators.)

	Yes	No	I don't know	
1. Faculty	38	62	___	(7)
2. Students	48	52	___	(8)
3. Administrators	44	56	___	(12)
4. ______Does not apply				

PLEASE EXPLAIN THE NATURE OF THIS FEEDBACK. REFER TO EACH GROUP FOR WHICH YOU INDICATED FEEDBACK.

7. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE COUNSELORS AT THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE INVOLVED WITH SCHOOL POLICY RELATED TO THE COUNSELING PROGRAM? (e.g., counselor confidentiality, etc.)

1. 62 They have considerable input and influence
2. 37 They have some limited input
3. 2 They have no input
4. (3) I don't know

8. HOW ACCESSIBLE ARE THE COUNSELORS AT THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE? (Please check all items that apply.)

1. 2 Students have a long waiting period for an appointment
2. 39 An appointment is generally scheduled a few days after a student requests one
3. 55 Students may walk-in, no appointment is necessary
4. 83 In addition to scheduled appointments, a counselor is available for walk-in sessions
5. 44 Special effort is made to reach students in need of counseling who do not ordinarily request an appointment
6. 24 Other (Please specify: ______________________)

9. WHEN YOU SEE STUDENTS FOR A SCHEDULED APPOINTMENT, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING KINDS OF RECORDS DO YOU HAVE READILY ACCESSIBLE FOR EACH STUDENT? (Please check all that apply.)

1. 88 High school transcript
2. 97 Grades at college
3. 67 Aptitude and achievement test scores
4. 13 Disciplinary record
5. 9 Extracurricular and work record
6. 8 Personal comments from teachers
7. 0 No files are accessible
8. 19 Other (Please specify: ________________)

10. WHEN YOU SEE STUDENTS FOR SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS, HOW LONG IS THE AVERAGE APPOINTMENT?

1. 6 Less than 15 minutes
2. 61 15 to 30 minutes
3. 33 30 to 60 minutes

11. IS THIS AMOUNT OF TIME USUALLY SUFFICIENT?

1. 91 Yes
2. 9 No

12. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR COUNSELING SESSIONS ARE DEVOTED TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (Time should total 100%)

1. ____ % Program planning (course selection) (See page 3a)
2. ____ % Vocational guidance
3. ____ % Counseling on academic problems
4. ____ % Counseling on personal problems
5. ____ % Other (Please specify: ________________)

13. WHAT DEGREE OF CONFIDENTIALITY ARE COUNSELORS AT THIS JUNIOR COLLEGE ALLOWED TO MAINTAIN WITH STUDENTS?

1. 87 Total confidentiality
2. 13 Some
3. ____ Very limited

(0)

12. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR COUNSELING SESSIONS ARE DEVOTED TO EACH OF THE FOLLWOING ACTIVITIES: (Time should total 100%)

1. Program planning:

% of sessions	% response
0	4
1	1
2	1
10	10
13	1
15	6
20	6
25	7
30	10
33	1
35	2
40	8
50	20
60	4
65	2
70	6
73	1
75	3
80	3
95	2
	(2)

2. Vocational guidance:

% of sessions	% response
0	6
2	1
4	1
5	10
7	1
10	17
12	1
15	11
20	27
25	7
30	7
40	2
50	5
60	3
	(2)

3. Academic problems:

% of sessions	% response
0	8
2	1
5	9
8	1
10	26
15	16
20	22
25	6
30	5
34	1
40	3
50	1
55	1
	(2)

12. (cont'd)

4. Personal problems:

% of sessions	% response
0	6
1	1
2	2
5	8
10	35
15	5
20	12
25	4
30	6
33	1
35	2
48	1
50	7
55	1
60	2
65	1
70	1
75	2
100	1
	(2)

5. Other:

% of sessions	% response
0	79
1	1
5	2
10	8
15	1
20	3
25	1
44	1
50	1
75	1
100	1
	(4)

14. DO YOU KEEP A RECORD OF WHAT HAPPENS DURING EACH COUNSELING SESSION?

1. 11 Yes, always
2. 39 Yes, most times
3. 40 Yes, sometimes
4. 10 No files are kept

(1)

15. IF FILES ARE KEPT, HOW WOULD YOU CLASSIFY THESE RECORDS?

1. 13 Formal records
2. 15 Formal notes
3. 72 Informal notes
4. 0 Does not apply

(20)

16. HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU SEE THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF STUDENTS? (Please check the appropriate column for each type of student.)

	Seen frequently	Seen occasionally	Seldom seen	
1. Students who make voluntary appointments	87	13	0	(2)
2. Students who walk in for informal counseling	75	26	0	(1)
3. Students registered for compulsory appointment	29	18	53	(12)
4. Students you contact for an appointment	16	56	28	(5)

17. IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT ARE THE MAJOR PROBLEMS OF YOUR STUDENTS (e.g., low ability, unrealistic aspirations, lack of vocational information, uncertainty about future plans.)

Personal - 34
Educational and academic disadvantagement - 41
Poor study habits - 8
Unrealistic aspirations - 34
Lack vocational and academic information - 37
Uncertainty of future - 57
Financial - 20
Other - 8

18. WHAT METHODS DO YOU USE TO REACH STUDENTS WHO ARE IN NEED OF COUNSELING ASSISTANCE, BUT DO NOT COME TO THE COUNSELING OFFICE FOR HELP?

Counselor available outside office - 40; Group counseling, referrals - 14; Printed publicity - 10; Monitor student records - 12; Faculty referrals - 30; Seek "no-shows" - 38

19. WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE CHANGED THAT WOULD INCREASE YOUR JOB SATISFACTION?

Additional counseling time - 20; Lower work load - 21; Professional growth opportunity - 9; Policy change regarding students - 11; Better staff communication - 18; Increased outreach opportunity - 7; Other - 43

20. WHAT DO YOU THINK WOULD IMPROVE THE STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAM? (Please check all items that apply.)

1. 24 More time for vocational testing
2. 53 More group counseling
3. 40 More time to deal with students who have academic problems
4. 57 More time for personal counseling other than program advisement, scheduling, etc.
5. 20 More information on students' performance
6. 32 Other (Please specify: ____________________)

21. IF YOU COULD MAKE ONLY ONE SUGGESTION TO IMPROVE THE STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAM, WHAT WOULD IT BE?

Lower work load - 16; Better staff communication - 9; Improve counseling quality - 11; Clarify counselor role - 10; Increased outreach opportunity - 12; More stress counseling - 9; Change leadership - 10; Other - 25

22. DO YOU FEEL YOUR COUNSELING PROGRAM IS REACHING THE STUDENTS WHO NEED IT?

1. 71 Yes
2. 28 No
3. ____ I don't know

(If no, please explain: Unable to reach needy students - 21; Lack of outreach time - 5; Lack of time for student problems - 16; Students don't seek help - 26; Students ignorant of or opposed to counseling - 21; Other - 11

23. HOW COULD COUNSELING SESSIONS BE IMPROVED? (Please explain briefly.)

Improved counselor quality - 22; Access to more information regarding students - 4; More time with students - 26; Better physical environment - 26; Scheduling flexibility - 10; Other - 31

24. IF YOU HAD A CHOICE, HOW WOULD YOU PREFER TO SPEND YOUR TIME PROFESSIONALLY?

Current is satisfactory - 32;
Personal, vocational, academic counseling - 33;
Teaching - 10;
Outreach activities - 13;
Professional growth - 8;
Other - 20

TABLE TO CHAPTER 7

TABLE 7-1

COUNSELORS WHO REPORTED SPENDING VARIOUS PROPORTIONS OF THEIR TIME IN VARIOUS COUNSELING ACTIVITIES

Counseling activity	Percentage of counseling sessions	Percentage of counselors
Program planning	0-20	29
	21-40	29
	41-60	24
	61-80	15
	80-100	2
Vocational guidance	0-20	75
	21-40	16
	51-100	3
Academic problems	0-20	82
	21-40	15
	11-100	2
Personal problems	0-20	69
	21-40	13
	41-60	11
	61-100	4
Other student needs	0-20	95
	21-100	4

APPENDIX F

TABLES TO CHAPTER 8

TABLE 8-1

FACULTY'S PERCEPTION OF PRESENT AND FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES (IN PERCENT)

Priorities	Present	Future
Most Important		
General education for transfer to a four-year institution.	50.0	39.8
Occupational programs leading to a certificate or associate degree.	47.2	41.3
Least Important		
Preparation in a specific subject field for transfer to a four-year institution.	33.3	37.8
Continuing education (college credit).	29.3	29.1
Adult education (non-college credit).	29.3	29.1

TABLE 8-2

STUDENTS' REASONS FOR THEIR ATTENDANCE AT THEIR PARTICULAR COLLEGES (IN PERCENT)

Reason	First importance	Second importance	Third importance	Total*
Low cost	29.1	25.3	22.6	77.0
Closeness to home	20.3	37.7	20.0	77.0
Particular courses	27.0	13.5	19.3	59.8
Total	76.4	76.5	61.9	

*Total percent indicating an influence as first, second, or third in importance.

TABLE 8-3

FACULTY'S POOLED PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS STUDENTS DO VERSUS SHOULD RECEIVE VERY MUCH (IN PERCENT)

	Benefits Received		
Area of Benefits	Actual	Preferable	Difference
Critical thinking	17.3	55.1	37.8
Human relations	16.1	52.2	36.1
Humanistic	18.2	53.1	34.9
Vocational	35.8	59.1	23.3

TABLE 8-4

THE THREE STUDENT BENEFITS ELICITING THE GREATEST AND LEAST DIFFERENCES IN THE FACULTY'S PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT THEIR STUDENTS DO VERSUS SHOULD RECEIVE (IN PERCENT)

Item	Dimension of benefit	Reception of benefit		Difference
		Actual	Preferable	
Greatest difference				
Writing and speaking skills (clear, correct, effective communication)	Humanistic	24.0	79.4	55.4
Critical thinking (logic, inference, nature and limitations of knowledge	Critical Thinking	11.3	63.7	52.4
Tolerance and understanding of other people and their values	Human Relations	17.5	65.9	48.4
Personal development (understanding one's abilities and limitations, interests and standards of behavior	Human Relations	22.5	70.8	48.3
Least difference				
Appreciation of religion (moral and ethical standards)	Human Relations	3.9	23.8	19.9
Vocational training (skills and techniques directly applicable to job)	Vocational	59.8	77.7	17.9
Background and specialization for further education in some professional scientific or scholarly field	Vocational	35.9	49.5	13.6

TABLE 8-5

THE FACULTY'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE MOST IMPORTANT STUDENT EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Item	Dimension of benefit	Percent
Personal development (understanding one's abilities and limitations, interests and standards of behavior)	Human Relations	23.0
Vocational training (skills and techniques directly applicable to job)	Vocational	17.5
Tolerance and understanding of other people and their values	Human Relations	14.1
Critical thinking (logic, inference, nature and limitations of knowledge)	Critical Thinking	10.0
Development of friendships and loyalties of lasting value	Human Relations	0.2
Vocabulary, terminology and facts in various fields of knowledge	Vocational	0.2

TABLE 8-6

THE COUNSELORS' PERCEPTIONS OF MAJOR STUDENT PROBLEMS

Problem	Percent
Uncertainty of future	57.1
Educational and academic disadvantages	40.8
Vocational and academic information	36.7
Personal	33.7
Unrealistic aspirations	33.7
Financial problems	20.4
Poor study habits	8.2
Other	8.2

TABLE 8-7

COMPARISON OF COUNSELOR AND STUDENT RESPONSES CONCERNING LENGTH OF AVERAGE COUNSELING APPOINTMENTS (IN PERCENT)

Length of average appointment	Counselors	Students
Less than fifteen minutes	6.1	39.9
Fifteen to thirty minutes	58.6	52.9
Thirty to sixty minutes	31.3	6.4
No response	4.0	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0

TABLE 8-8

COMPARISON OF FACULTY AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS (IN PERCENT)

Service	FACULTY				STUDENTS				
	Strong	Average	Weak	Total	Strong	Average	Weak	No Option	Total
Admissions and registration	32	51	17	100	23	50	18	9	100
Records and information	34	56	10	100	19	55	10	16	100
Academic guidance	23	48	29	100	26	43	16	15	100
Vocational guidance	26	44	30	100	23	38	16	23	100
Placement for work	19	48	33	100	11	31	18	40	100
Financial aids	32	51	17	100	16	33	14	37	100
Student activities	14	57	29	100	18	37	23	22	100
Special counseling for disadvantaged students	31	46	23	100	17	22	12	49	100
Special counseling for students with academic problems	20	48	32	100	17	28	12	43	100

TABLE 8-9

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF CURRENT AND IDEAL COMMUNITY BENEFITS: THREE HIGHEST AND THREE LOWEST PERCENTAGE RESPONSES FOR EACH CATEGORY

Benefit	MOST IMPORTANT		SECOND MOST IMPORTANT		THIRD MOST IMPORTANT		TOTAL*	
	Current	Ideal	Current	Ideal	Current	Ideal	Current	Ideal
Offering exposure to higher education to students who, for financial reasons, would not otherwise have had such an opportunity.	44.7	37.4	26.1	25.1	10.1	10.9	80.9	73.4
Allowing undecided students an opportunity to explore alternative educational/vocational paths.	24.2	20.4	33.4	25.8	14.8	16.3	72.4	62.5
Training of skilled personnel to fill manpower needs of local industry.	20.4	21.4	11.9	11.2	19.8	15.6	52.1	48.2
Providing facilities for community use.	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.6	5.3	2.4	6.8	4.2
Attracting or holding significant business and industry to the community.	0.0	0.4	0.5	1.4	1.7	2.9	2.2	4.7
I don't know enough about the community to give an opinion.	1.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.5	1.1

*Percent indicating each benefit as first, second or third most important.

TABLE 8-10

NUMBER OF VOCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL DEANS INDICATING SPECIFIC INSTRUCTOR QUALIFICATIONS

Qualification	Instructional Deans	Vocational Deans*	Combined**
Interest in students	7	6	13
Understand philosophy of community colleges	5	5	10
Commitment to teaching	4	3	7
Ability to teach	4	2	6
Knowledge of field	3	3	6
Motivation	0	3	3
Teaching experience	1	0	1
Work experience (for those in technical areas)	1	0	1
Experience (general)	1	0	1
Dynamic personality	1	0	1
Involvement in society	1	0	1
Open to people and ideas	0	1	1

* N=13, as two colleges did not have such a position.

** N=25, as three deans hold both positions simultaneously.

TABLE 8-11

FACULTY RATINGS
OF INSTRUCTOR QUALIFICATIONS (IN PERCENT)

Qualification	Most Important	Second Most Important	Third Most Important	Total*
Demonstrated interest in student problems and activities	34.6	25.6	14.9	75.1
Wide range of work experience other than teaching	15.1	19.4	19.7	54.2
Teaching experience at the junior college level	13.2	14.8	16.2	44.2
Teaching experience at the elementary or secondary level	6.6	7.3	7.8	21.7
Outstanding undergraduate/ graduate academic record	5.8	5.5	8.7	20.0
Demonstrated scholarly work	3.1	7.5	7.0	17.6
Teaching experience at a four-year institution	1.5	3.5	4.1	9.1
Other	11.8	5.5	7.3	24.6
No Response	8.3	10.9	14.3	33.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	300.0

*Total percentage rating a qualification as first, second or third most important.

APPENDIX G

FORM LETTERS SENT TO SURVEY SUBJECTS

Letter to Students from College President

Dear Student:

Smith Community College has been included in a national study of junior colleges being conducted by the University of California at Los Angeles for the U. S. Office of Education. The major objective of the study is to examine the characteristics of junior college students, faculty, counselors and administrators in order to provide the government with vital information about junior colleges. It will also supply information which could be used for the improvement of our own educational programs as well as those of other institutions.

Your name was selected at random to participate in the study, and your participation is important as a representative of Smith Community College. Your responses will be completely confidential, and individuals in the study will be anonymous.

Because only a small number of people from this school were selected to participate, I strongly urge your assistance, and thank you for your cooperation.

(Signed)
William Jones
President

WJ:ic

Letter to Students from Project Director

January 31, 1972

Dear Student:

A few weeks ago, we sent you a questionnaire and requested your cooperation with our study of junior college students. Since we have not yet received the post card indicating that you returned the questionnaire, we are wondering if the letter was lost in the mail. In any event, we are enclosing a duplicate questionnaire, and again ask that you complete it now and mail it to us at your earliest convenience.

Many of your classmates have already returned their questionnaires, and it is extremely important that we hear from you too. Your responses will provide valuable information to all junior colleges in making decisions that affect students' educational experiences.

Once again, we ask you to fill out, sign and mail without delay the questionnaire and the post card. In doing so, you will be doing us a great service.

Again, our thanks for your cooperation, and remember, we are counting on you.

Sincerely,

(Signed)
James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

JWT:lsk

Letter to Faculty from College President

Dear Faculty Member:

Smith Community College has been included in a national study of junior colleges being conducted by the University of California at Los Angeles for the U. S. Office of Education. The major objective of the study is to examine the characteristics of junior college students, faculty, counselors and administrators in order to provide the government with vital information about junior colleges. It will also supply information which could be used for the improvement of our own educational programs as well as those of other institutions.

Your name was selected at random to participate in the study, and your participation is important as a representative of Smith Community College. Your responses will be completely confidential, and individuals in the study will be anonymous.

Because only a small number of people from this school were selected to participate, I strongly urge your assistance, and thank you for your cooperation.

(Signed)
William Jones
President

WJ:ic

Letter to Faculty from Project Director

February 7, 1972

Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago, we sent you a questionnaire and requested your cooperation with our study of junior colleges. We have not yet received the post card indicating that you returned the questionnaire.

We would like to remind you that your responses will provide valuable information to all junior colleges. Many of your colleagues have already returned their questionnaires, and it is extremely important that we hear from you too.

Once again, we ask you to fill out, sign and mail without delay the questionnaire and the post card. If you have already done so, please accept our appreciation and disregard this letter. If you have misplaced the questionnaire, please notify us and we will forward a duplicate immediately.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Signed)
James W. Trent
Principal Investigator

JWT:1sk

Letter to Counselors from College President

Dear Counselor:

Smith Community College has been included in a national study of junior colleges being conducted by the University of California at Los Angeles for the U. S. Office of Education. The major objective of the study is to examine the characteristics of junior college students, faculty, counselors, and administrators in order to provide the government with vital information about junior colleges. It will also supply information which could be used for the improvement of our educational programs as well as those of other institutions.

Because pupil personnel programs are of particular interest in the junior college institutions, I am requesting each of you to devote the short amount of time necessary to complete and return the questionnaire. Your responses will be completely confidential, and individual identity will be anonymous.

I urge your assistance in this study, and thank you for your cooperation.

(Signed)
William Jones
President

WJ:ic

Letter to College Staff Members
Supervising Follow-Up of Student Non-Respondents

February 18, 1972

Dear

The student response rate to our survey has been encouraging, with over 50% returns from most schools in our sample. Our final attempt to increase the returns will depend, to a large extent, upon you and your student assistants, and we hope that the assignment will both be interesting to you and productive for us.

Since schools and communities vary, we are leaving most of the decisions on how to approach this task up to you. However, some suggestions might help. For example, unless students are easily located in class, we suggest contact by telephone.

On February 28th, we will send you the list of your college's student sample. The names with no dates recorded in the right hand columns are the non-respondents who are to be contacted by your assistants. These assistants should record in the column farthest to the right, the results of each contact, using the following abbreviations:

n.c. = no contact
n.l.e. = no longer enrolled (or never really enrolled)
O.K. = agreed to fill out and return questionnaire
unwilling = expressed his unwillingness to cooperate (and, briefly, why) See enclosed example.

Your assistants should convey the following general information in their conversations with students:

> The Junior College Study at U.C.L.A. is nearing the deadline for questionnaire returns and are trying very hard to include responses from every student in the sample. Our records show that you have not returned the questionnaire, and we are requesting that you make a special effort to do so, as we are counting on you to help complete the information about students at this school. The knowledge gained from these questionnaires will provide valuable information about students in junior colleges. Completing the questionnaire should not require more than 30 to 40 minutes of your time. Would you please fill it out and return it and the postcard to U.C.L.A. within the next day or two? We would be very appreciative.

We are providing you with extra questionnaires (under separate cover) for students who have lost theirs. However, some procedures must be carefully observed. You will notice that the questionnaires are blue, green or orange, corresponding to Forms A (green), B (blue), or C (orange). The letter A, B, or C is written next to the name of each student on the list, indicating which form he is to fill out. In other words, each student is assigned a particular questionnaire form as indicated by the letter recorded next to his name, and it is only this form which he is to be given.

Regarding reimbursement, we are budgeted for one supervisor at each school, at $14.00 per hour (maximum, 10 hours). We suggest that you employ two students for a total of no more than 30 hours, each at $1.65 per hour. As we can allow only two weeks for this task, (from March 1 through March 15), each student would work about 15 hours per week if you employ two students. Each can probably make about five calls per hour, (including finding the telephone number), accounting for more calls than any of our sample schools require. If a student is calling from his own phone and incurs non-local charges, he should keep a record of these expenses and include that amount on his invoice.

The above figures are all speculative, depending upon how many non-respondents there are for your school, how many students you employ and how you schedule their time; but this should give you an idea of how to proceed.

To encourage your assistants to do their utmost in obtaining the co-operation of non-respondents, we are offering a bonus to those who succeed in persuading 50% or more of the non-respondents on their list to return the questionnaires. "Success" will be determined by the number of postcards we receive. Therefore, the assistant's name should be on each page for which he is responsible, so that we can credit him with the postcards returned from his portion of the sample. Each assistant who achieves this 50% return quota will be paid $2.00 an hour for his time rather than the $1.65 rate.

Please note that there are five invoice forms enclosed, one for you and one for each of the students you employ. Please sign your own and that of each student, and return them to us with the student list by the 15th of March.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me collect at 213-825-7831.

Respectfully yours,

Felice Karman
Executive Officer, Study of
Junior Colleges

FK:ah
Encls. 6